

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

<http://www.archive.org/details/annualreportofst6667mary>





STATEWIDE PLANNING

REPORT OF THE
STATE OF MARYLAND
ADVISORY COUNCIL
FOR
HIGHER EDUCATION



To His Excellency, THE GOVERNOR
AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
STATE OF MARYLAND

ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

STATE-WIDE PLANNING:
DEVELOPMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN

PRESENTED TO
HIS EXCELLENCY, THE GOVERNOR
AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE
STATE OF MARYLAND

Mayland
LC
175
M3A45
1966-67

January, 1967 Baltimore

7750219 v

STATE OF MARYLAND
ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

DR. G. RUSSEL TATUM, Chairman

DR. SHERMAN E. FLANAGAN, Vice-Chairman

HENRY J. KNOTT, Secretary

WILLIAM P. CHAFFINCH

ROY TASCO DAVIS

DOROTHY S. MALTBIE

BENJAMIN B. ROSENSTOCK

DR. HENRY C. WELCOME

ELLERY B. WOODWORTH

* * * * *

STAFF

DR. WESLEY N. DORN, Director

DR. JOSEPH F. KEIMIG, Assistant Director

DR. THEODORE S. CORIN, Specialist in Higher Education Programs

SHELDON H. KNORR, Specialist in Higher Education Finance

DALTON E. SMART, Specialist in Higher Education Information

CHRISTOPHER S. RHINES, Special Studies

State Office Annex
2100 Guilford Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

STATE OF MARYLAND
ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
2100 Guilford Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

January 31, 1967

THE HONORABLE SPIRO T. AGNEW
Governor, State of Maryland
Annapolis, Maryland

Your Excellency:

In accordance with the provision of the laws of Maryland, the Advisory Council for Higher Education has the honor to present to you here-with the Third Annual Report of its activities including a report of the nature, progress, and results of studies it has undertaken together with plans and recommendations with respect to the matters it has considered.

The Council has given a second year of study to the matter of Community College Governance. It is the unanimous feeling of the Council that one of the most important actions that can be taken by the Executive Branch and the Legislature to strengthen the Tri-Partite System of Public Higher Education in Maryland is the creation of a State Board for Community Colleges, separate and distinct from the Board which governs the State's Public School System.

During the past year, the Council has also engaged in a number of new studies with the cooperation of committees composed of outstanding persons who are making valuable contributions to the Council's work. New opportunities have been made available to improve two-way communication between lay citizens and educators. A notable example is the Governor's Conference on Higher Education which provided the first opportunity on a State-wide basis in Maryland for face-to-face exchange of ideas about higher education.

It is within this concept of maximum involvement of persons and groups interested in and affected by the progress of higher education in Maryland that the Council continues its State-wide planning of higher education to meet the new needs of the State as they become apparent. The Council pledges to you and the citizens of Maryland that it will continue to exert every effort toward the "objective of achieving the most effective and economical employment of existing educational facilities and of fostering a climate of cooperation and unified endeavor in the field of public higher education."

Respectfully,

DR. G. RUSSELL TATUM, Chairman
DR. SHERMAN E. FLANAGAN, Vice-Chairman
HENRY J. KNOTT, Secretary
WILLIAM P. CHAFFINCH
ROY TASCO DAVIS
DOROTHY S. MALTBIE
BENJAMIN B. ROSENSTOCK
DR. HENRY C. WELCOME
ELLERY B. WOODWORTH



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP	iii
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	v
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS	xiii
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	1-1
Council Organization and Responsibilities -	
Council Activities - Council Reports and	
Recommendations	
CHAPTER II - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	2-1
CHAPTER III - THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	3-1
Purpose of a Master Plan - Master Plan	
Concepts - Master Plan Content - The	
Next Steps	
CHAPTER IV - STATISTICAL EVIDENCE	4-1
Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollments in	
State-Approved Maryland Colleges and	
Universities - Enrollment in Types of	
Maryland Institutions - Full-Time Freshmen	
in Maryland Colleges - Financing Higher	
Education - Graduate Enrollment -	
Projections	
CHAPTER V - 1966 POST-HIGH SCHOOL PLANS OF SENIORS IN MARYLAND SCHOOLS SURVEY	5-1
Interest and Plans of Seniors - Plans for	
Maryland Institutions - Non-Degree Granting	
Institutions in Maryland - Plans for Post-High	
School Education in Other States by Maryland	
Seniors - Selection of Types of Institutions in	
Other States by Maryland Seniors - Students	
Not Planning to Continue Post-High School	
Education - Validity of the Survey Instruments	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

	Page
CHAPTER VI - SUMMARY OF GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE	6-1
Program - Outcomes	
CHAPTER VII - COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE AND COORDINATION	7-1
Development of the Tri-Partite System As The Fundamental Structure of Maryland's Master Plan - The Concern for Separate Boards - Basic Principles - The Reasons for Separate Boards - The Recommendations	
CHAPTER VIII - STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE STUDY: SCHOLARSHIPS AND LOANS	8-1
Introduction - Basic Principles - Present Programs - Problems of the Present Assistance Programs - Recommendations	
CHAPTER IX - FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY STUDY	9-1
The Urgency of the Higher Education Salary Question - Purpose, Nature and Scope of the Study - Sources and Kinds of Data - Findings of the Study - Recommendations - Guidelines for Implementation of Recommendations - Rationale for Immediate Action	
CHAPTER X - POPULATION ANALYSIS	10-1
Nature and Purpose - Demographic Variables - Diversity in Maryland - Future Plans	
CHAPTER XI - UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATION	11-1
Facility Utilization and Enrollment Pressures - Consideration of Other Factors - Recommendations	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Page

CHAPTER XII - PILOT STUDY OF RECIPROCITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION	12-1
Steps Taken - Preliminary Findings of Pilot Study - Conclusions - Recommendation	
CHAPTER XIII - PROGRAMS	13-1
Initiation of New Programs - Studies to Determine the Need for Programs	
CHAPTER XIV - STUDY OF LIBRARY FACILITIES, SERVICES AND COOPERATION	14-1
Previous Studies of Public College and University Libraries - Background of the Present Study - Development and Scope of the Present Study	
CHAPTER XV - SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING LABORATORY STUDY	15-1
CHAPTER XVI - DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MARYLAND - 1966	16-1
Expansion of the University of Maryland - Development of State Colleges - Development of Community Colleges - Cooperation of Private Colleges and Universities - Development of a Maryland Educational Data Network - Development of an Educational Television Network - Cooperation Among State Agencies - Communication Between the Community and Higher Education - Cooperation with the United States Office of Education - Cooperation with Other States	

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

1	Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment (at State Approved Maryland Colleges and Universities) By Type, Location and Percentage Increase - Fall 1966	4-4
2	Number and Percent of Undergraduate Students Enrolled in State Approved Maryland Colleges and Universities - Fall 1966 by Type and Level of Institution	4-8
3	Full-Time Freshman Enrollments at State Approved Maryland Colleges and Universities by Type - Fall 1966, with Percent Change Over Fall 1965	4-9
4	State of Maryland Appropriations for Public Education Showing Allocation for Higher Education Operating Purposes for Fiscal Year 1967 with Percentage Increase Over Fiscal Year 1966	4-10
5	1966 Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools	5-5
6	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Selecting Four-Year Public Colleges in Maryland as a First Choice by College and County of High School Attendance	5-6
7	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Selecting Public Community Colleges in Maryland as a First Choice, by College and County of High School Attendance	5-7
8	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Selecting Independent Colleges in Maryland as a First Choice by College and County of High School Attendance	5-8
9	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Selecting Post-High School Education in Maryland Institutions Other Than Community or Four-Year Colleges by Type of School and County of High School Attendance	5-10

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
10	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Selecting All Types of Post-High School Education in Other States as a First Choice by State and County of High School Attendance.	5-10
11	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Selecting Post-High School Education in Other States by Type of Education and County of High School Attendance	5-12
12	1966 Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools	5-13
13	Percent of Seniors Giving Reasons for Not Attending School Beyond High School by Reason and County of High School Attendance	5-14
14	State Programs of General Student Financial Assistance: Financial Summary	8-7
15	Possible Financial Structure of Recommended State Financial Assistance Programs	8-19
16	Maryland State College Average Salaries for 1966-1967 Compared with National Average salaries of State Colleges for 1966-1967 for All Ranks and Each Academic Rank	9-4
17	University of Maryland Average Salaries for 1966-1967 Compared with National Average Salaries of Large Public Universities with Enrollments of 10,000 or More Students for 1966-1967 for All Ranks and for Each Academic Rank	9-5
18	Cost of Bringing Maryland State College Average Salaries Up to the Seventy-fifth Percentile by Means of Equal Annual Increases, Including Allowance for an 6.5% Increase, To Reach Goal by 1970-1971	9-9

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table

Page

19	Cost of Bringing the University of Maryland Average Salaries Up to the Seventy-fifth Percentile by Means of Equal Annual Increases, Including Allowance for an Annual 6.5% Increase, To Reach Goal by 1970-1971	9-10
20	Recommended Space Factors for a Basic 55 Hour Week, by Size of Institution, for Classrooms and Laboratories.	11-2
21	Square Feet of Classroom and Laboratory Space in Publicly Supported Institutions, With New Expectancy by 1970	11-4
22	Space Factors for Publicly Supported Institutions, Fall 1965, and Projected to 1970.	11-5
23	Distribution of Maryland Students Attending Out-of-State Institutions in the United States by Region, Type of Control, Level and Total	12-5
24	Student Out-Migration	12-6
25	Out-Migration of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors.	12-7
26	Percent of Maryland Residents in Neighboring States by State for Total Student Enrollment and Total Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment in Public and Private Institutions	12-8
27	1966 Maryland High School Seniors Planning to Continue Their Post-High School Education in Neighboring States for Public and Private Institutions by State and Percent of Total	12-8
28	Number of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Surveyed Selecting Schools in Neighboring States by Kind of Institution and State	12-9
29	Percent of 1966 Maryland High School Seniors Giving Reasons for Attending Schools Outside of Maryland	12-10

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

POLICY COMMITTEE ON ROLE AND SCOPE OF INSTITUTIONS

Roy Tasco Davis, Committee Chairman

Mr. W. T. Boston	Assistant State Superintendent in Certification and Accreditation
Dr. Randle Elliott	President, Hood College
Dr. R. E. Gibson	Director, Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins University
Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.	Executive Director, American Associa- tion of Junior Colleges
Dr. Earle T. Hawkins	President, Towson State College
Dr. R. Lee Hornbake	Vice-President for Academic Affairs, University of Maryland
Dr. Martin D. Jenkins	President, Morgan State College
Dr. Oliver H. Laine	President, Catonsville Community College
Dr. Edward C. Pomeroy	Executive Secretary, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Mrs. Sherman Ross	Corresponding Secretary, Maryland Division, American Association of University Women
Dr. John Walton	President, Maryland Association for Higher Education, The Johns Hopkins University
Mr. Ellery B. Woodworth	Vice-Chairman of Committee on Role and Scope of Institutions

POLICY COMMITTEE ON SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Mr. William P. Chaffinch, Chairman

Mr. William E. Coyle	Director, Public Relations and Business Development Suburban Trust Company
Mr. Robert Y. Dubel	Associate Executive Secretary, Maryland State Teachers Association
Professor William H. Fauntleroy	Principal, Moton Senior-Junior High School
Mr. Daniel Z. Gibson	President, Washington College
Mr. Wallace Hamilton	Director, Institutional Planning The Rouse Company
Dr. Richard D. Weigle	President, St. Johns College
Mr. Milton White	White and Leonard
Mr. William L. Wilson	President, Board of Trustees of the State Colleges

DATA COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES
Mr. Henry J. Knott, Chairman

Dr. Frank L. Bentz, Jr.	Assistant to the President, University of Maryland
Dr. Wilbur Devilbiss	President, Salisbury State College
Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower	President, The Johns Hopkins University
Dr. Lowell S. Ensor	President, Western Maryland College
Mr. Robert D. H. Harvey	Vice-Chairman of Board, Maryland National Bank

Data Committee on Institutional Facilities - Continued

Mr. J. Jefferson Miller	Project General Manager, Charles Center Management Office
Mr. James J. O'Donnell	Director, State Planning Department
Dr. Harold D. Reese	Assistant Director, Division of Certification and Accreditation, State Department of Education
Sister Rosemary Pfaff, D. C.	President, St. Joseph's College
DATA COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS	
Mr. Benjamin B. Rosenstock, Chairman	
Mr. Joseph R. Aumiller	Staff Accountant, Financial Studies, C & P Telephone Company of Maryland
Dr. Howard Bosley	Supervisor in Higher Education, Maryland State Department of Education
Dr. Louis Conger, Jr.	Chief, Educational and Social Stratification Branch, Population Division Bureau of the Census
Dr. Emory Cook	President, Operations Research, Inc.
Mr. David Gillis	General Accounting Supervisor, C & P Telephone Company of Maryland
Mr. Robert A. Israel	Chief, Statistical Research and Records, State Department of Health
Dr. Robert McClintock	Director of Institutional Research, University of Maryland
Mrs. Regina Seltzer	Research Analyst, State of Maryland Planning Department
Mr. Charles W. Thomas	Staff Specialist, Finance and Management, Board of Trustees of the State Colleges

DATA COMMITTEE ON COSTS OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
Dr. Sherman E. Flanagan, Chairman

Dr. Paul D. Cooper	Director, State Fiscal Research Bureau
Mr. Comer Coppie	Executive Director, Board of Trustees for the State Colleges
Reverend Joseph K. Drane	Regional Director of Higher Education of Jesuit Education Association
Dr. Quentin L. Earhart	Assistant State Superintendent in Administration and Finance, Maryland State Department of Education
Dr. Harry Fisher	Comptroller and Budget Officer, University of Maryland
Dr. William E. Henry	President, Bowie State College
Dr. Bruce J. Partridge	Vice-President for Finance and Treasurer, The Johns Hopkins University
Mr. J. Robert Sherwood	President, Suburban Trust Company
Dr. Andrew G. Truxal	President, Anne Arundel Junior College
Mr. William C. Witler	Partner, Haskins and Sells, First National Bank Building
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY VIEWPOINT	
Mrs. Dorothy S. Maltbie, Chairman	
Mr. Robert B. Alexander	General Manager of Personnel, C&P Telephone Company of Maryland
Mr. Walter H. Buchman	Director of Industrial Relations, Aircraft Armaments, Incorporated

Special Committee on Community Viewpoint - Continued

Mr. Edwin Castagna	Director, Enoch Pratt Free Library
Mr. Mark F. Collins	Publisher, Baltimore News-American
Mr. John F. Connors	Director of Education, the Martin-Marietta Company
Mr. John Hosford	Chief of Research, State Department of Economic Development
Mr. Clifford C. James	Advisory Council for Maryland Small Business Administration
Dr. Elaine Davis	Supervisor of Special Studies and Programs, Baltimore City Schools
Mrs. M. Shakman Katz	Member of Central Scholarship Board
Mr. Louis B. Kohn, II	President, Hochschild Kohn and Company
Mrs. Howard Koss	State President, League of Women Voters of Maryland
Dr. Otto F. Kraushaar	President, Goucher College
Mr. Donald C. Lee	Manager, Industrial Relations Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Sister Margaret Mary, S.S.N.D.	President, College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Mr. Milton H. Miller	Past President, Junior Association of Commerce
Mr. Robert S. Moyer	Associate Director for Planning and Development, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency

Special Committee on Community Viewpoint - Continued

Mr. Gwinn Owens	Editorial Researcher, WJZ-TV
Mrs. Gordon W. Prange	President, Maryland Division, American Association of University Women
Mrs. Vilma Rector	Assistant Executive Director, Baltimore Urban League
Mr. Donald J. Shank	Director, Wye Institute
Mr. Joseph Showalter	Past President, Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers
Mr. Paul A. Wagner	Legislative Representative, United Auto Workers
Dr. K. Brantley Watson	Vice-President, Human Relations, McCormick and Company
Mr. Fred Wright, Jr.	President, Wright, Speicher and Gardner, Incorporated

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REPORTING PRACTICES
AND DATA PROCESSING

Dr. Henry C. Welcome, Chairman

Mr. Robert Bassford	Data Processing Systems Analyst, Maryland State Depart- ment of Education
Mr. Jerome W. Geckle	Vice-President for Education, Data Processing Management Association
Mr. George E. Miller	Chief of Computer Users Services, University of Maryland
Mr. Murray Pfeferman	Head of Systems Design and De- velopment Group, U.S. Office of Education
Dr. Broadus E. Sawyer	Professor of Economics, Morgan State College

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE NEED FOR A THIRD MEDICAL
SCHOOL AND HEALTH MANPOWER NEEDS IN MARYLAND
Mr. Ellery B. Woodworth, Chairman

Mr. John M. Baer	President, Advisory Council of Hagerstown Junior College
Mr. Seymour Berlin	Director, Bureau of Executive Manpower, Civil Service Commission
Dr. Evelyn E. Cohelan	Associate Professor, School of Nursing University of Maryland
Dr. J. Roy Guyther	Maryland Medical and Chirurgical Faculty, Mechanicsville
Dr. Albin O. Kuhn	Vice-President of Baltimore Campuses, University of Maryland, Catonsville Branch
Dr. Oliver Laine	Chairman, Council of Community College Presidents
Mr. James J. O'Donnell	Director, State Planning Department
Dr. William J. Peeples	Commissioner, State Health Department
Dr. Michael Pelczar	Vice-President for Graduate Studies and Research, University of Maryland
Mr. Rudolf J. Pendall	Executive Director, Maryland Hospital Council
Dr. Harold D. Reese	Assistant Director, Division of Certification and Accreditation, State Department of Education
Dr. Richard S. Ross	Professor of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins Hospital
Dr. John J. Salley	Dean, School of Dentistry, University of Maryland
Mr. Kenneth G. Skaggs	Staff Specialist, American Association of Junior Colleges
Dr. Edward S. Stafford	Associate Professor of Surgery, The Johns Hopkins University

Committee to Study the Need for a Third Medical School and Health
Manpower Needs in Maryland - Continued

Mr. Saul I. Stern	Chairman, State Planning Commission
Dr. William S. Stone	Dean, School of Medicine, University of Maryland
Miss Alice M. Sundberg	President, Maryland Nurses Association
Dr. Thomas B. Turner	Dean, Medical Faculty, The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
Dr. Jerusa C. Wilson	Staff Specialist on Academic Affairs, Board of Trustees of the State Colleges
Dr. Robert E. Zadek	Medical Doctor

STEERING COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL
MANPOWER NEEDS

Dr. Sherman E. Flanagan, Chairman pro tem

Mr. H. McC. Brogden	Supervisor of Industrial Relations, American Can Company
Mr. John F. Connors	Director of Education, Martin-Marietta Company
Mr. Donald DeHaven	Training Director, Maryland National Bank
Mr. R. W. Hammond	Secretary, Frederick Chamber of Commerce
Mrs. Evelyn Handy	Superintendent of Training and Executive Placement, Hutzler Brothers Company
Mr. William F. Hering	Manager, Sinclair Refining Company

**Steering Committee on Business and Industrial
Manpower Needs - Continued**

Mr. Donald C. Lee	Manager, Industrial Relations, Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Mr. Jonathan F. McCray	Staff Supervisor, The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland
Mr. Reed D. O'Connell	Assistant to Manager, Armco Steel Corporation
Mr. Robert C. Petersen	Manager, Cumberland Chamber of Commerce
Mr. R. Melvin Ulm	Vice President, First National Bank of Maryland Salisbury
Dr. K. Brantley Watson	Vice-President, Human Relations, McCormick and Company
Mr. Douglas Wishart	Corporate Director of Employee Development, Sherman Fairchild Technical Center

**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVENTORY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**
Dr. Theodore S. Corin, Chairman

Dr. Robert E. McClintock	Director, Institutional Research, University of Maryland
Dr. Harold D. Reese	Assistant Director, Division of Certification and Accreditation, State Department of Education
Dr. W. Jackson Stenger	Assistant to the Vice President for the Campuses, University of Maryland
Dr. Robert L. Streiter	Associate Dean for Administration, The Johns Hopkins University
Dr. Jerusa C. Wilson	Staff Specialist on Academic Affairs, Board of Trustees of the State Colleges



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The present system of higher education in Maryland has evolved as a result of dedicated efforts by many individuals and by a number of outstanding commissions that recognized the importance of higher education as one of the most significant investments — perhaps the most important investment — that the State can make in its future. The fact that society is constantly changing and that colleges and universities, as institutions serving that society, must respond to changing needs has been recognized by the State for at least a half a century through the appointment of nine commissions to study higher education in Maryland, each of which recommended that a permanent commission be appointed and charged with the responsibility for the over-all development of the State system of public higher education. These recommendations have resulted in the creation of the present statutory State Advisory Council for Higher Education.

COUNCIL ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Council is charged by law with the preparation of higher education programs — academically, administratively, and fiscally — for the orderly growth and over-all development of the State system of higher education to meet trends in population and the changing social and technical requirements of the economy. The scope of the Council's studies includes the investigation of the needs throughout the State for undergraduate, graduate and adult education, for professional and technical training and for research facilities, and presentation of plans and recommendations for the establishment and location of new facilities and programs.

The Council consists of nine lay members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for six-year terms. The initial membership of the Council were appointed on July 1, 1964. The Council began its operations during fiscal 1965 with one professional staff member. Once an agency had been created to deal with problems of planning and coordination, it became immediately apparent that additional staff would be required to make the studies requested by the institutions of higher learning, their governing boards, the Governor, the Executive Branch, and the Legislature, which required in-depth objective study and a research approach. During the past eighteen months, the Council has recruited three additional professional staff members to assist in the investigation of needs, conduct of studies, preparation of programs, and the development of plans and recommendations.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

In carrying out its functions, the Council depends to a great extent upon its professional staff to organize its various studies, develop the research designs, and carry out the Council's projects. A great strength of the Council, however, is the contributions of thought and judgment made by the Council committees which are composed of outstanding educators and civic, professional, business, and community leaders. The State, then, has the benefit of the concentrated efforts of more than one hundred knowledgeable and highly competent persons from many fields to supplement the work of the Council and staff.

In addition to a number of special meetings, the Council has held regular monthly meetings during the past year to consider the issues that have been brought before it. During the past year, the Advisory Council has also met with boards of trustees and advisory groups on the campuses of Morgan State College, Frostburg State College, Hagerstown Junior College, and Allegany Community College. The Council had made similar visitations to other colleges during the previous year. These experiences have provided important insights into the work of these institutions. The Council has also had the benefit of getting points of view from experts from other states, such as those of Dr. Richard Browne, of the Illinois Board of Junior Colleges, and Dr. Albert Meder, Chairman of the Higher Education Commission of the Middle States Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. The work of the Council has also been supplemented by the use of a consultant firm, Nelson Associates, nationally known for its work in the field of library science.

Any research-oriented agency charged with the responsibility for making studies and presenting plans and recommendations must rely heavily on valid survey information. The institutions of higher learning, both public and private, have provided important information whenever it was requested. The State Department of Education and the Council on High School and College Relations, composed of representatives from public and private high schools and public and private colleges, have been extremely helpful in the State Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors. All statistical data collected by the Council are available in the Council offices to planning and operating agencies as soon as the data are obtained even prior to analysis and publication in the Council's reports.

COUNCIL REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the responsibility of the Council to report the result of its researches, and to make recommendations to the governing boards of the public institutions of higher learning and to appropriate State officials with respect to the matters it has considered.

The Council is also required to submit to the Governor and to the General Assembly an annual report of its activities, including the report of the nature, progress or result of any studies it has undertaken or completed, together with such plans or recommendations respecting public higher education as may be appropriate.

The Council was created to provide the objective guidance and sound advice which are needed for effective expansion of higher education in Maryland. The Council believes that, as a result of the broad base on which Council recommendations rest and the efforts made to involve persons and groups interested and affected by these recommendations, the acceptance of the Council's advice on these matters will strengthen the State's system of higher education. The Council recognizes that there are persons holding points of view opposed to those presented in this Report and that such opposing points of view are sincerely and honestly held. On the other hand, the Council has attempted to take into account the implications of the actions, or lack of action, proposed by various groups, in terms of the total interests of the State. It has carefully considered all the facts brought to its attention and, indeed, has taken the initiative of obtaining facts on its own when these were not available from the usual sources.

This Annual Report contains a resume of the work of the Council during the past year with a summary of the findings from the studies that have been conducted, recommendations that have emerged from these studies, progress reports, and future plans. By its very nature, this Report is brief in terms of the number and magnitude of the special studies being made. Detailed reports of some of the individual studies referred to in this book will be published separately for limited distribution. In such cases, reference is made in the appropriate chapter to these studies and they may be obtained from the Council upon request.

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This report contains a number of recommendations designed to improve the quality and availability of higher education in Maryland. The chapters that follow present the recommendations and the rationale behind them in more detail. Some of these recommendations are out-growths of those made last year particularly those concerned with community colleges.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1. It is recommended that a separate State Board for Community Colleges be established whose exclusive responsibility shall be that of Maryland's community colleges according to the guidelines and transition procedure set forth in Chapter VII. The new State Board for Community Colleges should have the powers, duties and functions set forth in Chapter VII.
2. It is recommended that any local board of education wishing to be divested of its responsibility for community college management be authorized to request at any time that the Governor appoint a separate board of community college trustees for its local unit. The new local boards of community college trustees should be established according to the guidelines in Chapter VII.
3. It is recommended that to encourage attendance at community colleges, the State support for these institutions be high enough so that students attending the community colleges have to pay less than they would if they were attending a four-year institution.

The Council noted in its 1966 report that the principle of 1/3 State, 1/3 county and 1/3 student share of the costs of community college education might eventually have to be altered and that perhaps the State should provide 50% or 60% with the balance of the costs shared equally by the county and the student.

Since community college tuition has now reached the state where in some cases it exceeds tuition for four-year institutions the Council feels that this recommendation for increased State support should now be put into effect.

4. It is recommended that the State support for capital funds for community colleges which provides up to 75% from State sources for some community colleges be broadened to include this level of support for all new community college construction.

GOVERNANCE OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PRESENTLY NOT WITHIN THE TRI-PARTITE SYSTEM

5. It is recommended that jurisdiction over Morgan State College be transferred to the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges as rapidly as is consistent with sound action and in accordance with the statutory provisions.

Maryland law provides that Morgan State College come within the jurisdiction of this Board when three of the former State Teachers Colleges have been regionally validated consistent with the new objectives of the State colleges.

The Advisory Council is exploring, with the Attorney General's Office, steps which should be taken and will make more specific recommendations when all the necessary facts and legal opinions are at hand.

St. Mary's College is in the process of becoming a four-year institution. The Advisory Council is exploring, with the Attorney General's Office, the relationship of this institution to the State system of public higher education, and expects to make more definitive recommendations when the four-year status of St. Mary's College is achieved.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE: SCHOLARSHIPS AND LOANS

6. It is recommended that, in order to provide for coordination of the State's various programs of student financial assistance and the implementation of the "package" approach to student aid, a new Maryland Student Financial Assistance Board be established, to administer the State's programs of scholarships and student loans, by a merger of the present State Scholarship Board and the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation. The members of the new Board should be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, taking advantage where possible of the knowledge and experience possessed by the members of the present scholarship and loan boards. Under this new Board, there should be separate directors for the administration of the scholarship and the loan programs.

7. It is recommended that a new, unified Program of general State scholarships be established, replacing the present General State Tuition Scholarship Program, Teacher Education Scholarship Program, and Legislative (Senatorial) Scholarship Program. Details of the new unified Program of Scholarships are set forth in Chapter VIII.
8. It is recommended that the State's guaranteed student loan program be expanded and broadened according to the provisions set forth in Chapter VIII.
9. It is recommended that, in order to provide financial assistance for students in non-academic fields of study, a new Program of guaranteed student loans be established for students enrolled in post-secondary vocational curricula, in conformity to the provisions of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1965. This Program to be administered by the Student Financial Assistance Board.
10. It is recommended that the State's policy of Tuition Waiver for Education students be applicable to students at St. Mary's College of Maryland, on the same basis as it applies elsewhere, when St. Mary's College develops a four-year program in Education.
11. It is recommended that the State's policy of Tuition Waiver for Education students be applicable, on the same basis as it applies elsewhere, to students enrolled in transfer programs in the State's public community colleges leading to teacher certification.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES

12. It is recommended that faculty and administrative salaries in Maryland State Colleges and the University of Maryland be raised to reach the seventy-fifth percentile for comparable institutions of the nation as a whole.
13. It is recommended that the year 1970-1971 (Fiscal 1971) be set as the target year for reaching the seventy-fifth percentile level for both faculty and administrative salaries and that the first step in reaching this goal be put into effect in the 1968 fiscal year.
14. It is recommended that the seventy-fifth percentile level be reached by Fiscal 1971 by means of equal annual salary increases over four consecutive fiscal periods.

15. It is recommended that the two-year colleges work toward the adoption of a system of differentiation of rank as a means of recognizing merit and rewarding competence.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATIONS

16. It is recommended that no major change in academic calendar seems necessary at the present time. Institutions may, however, find it advantageous to alter their calendar to better serve the needs of their students.
17. It is recommended that each institution work toward enhancing its summer session to adequately serve its own students as well as special groups. The goal should be to achieve year-round operation within the framework of the present calendar.
18. It is recommended that State support be given to the summer session in each institution to the degree that full-time undergraduates pay the same amount of money per credit hour as they pay during a regular semester.
19. It is recommended that the space utilization study by the Advisory Council be periodic, probably every two years, in order to allow the Council to have sufficient data to make intelligent recommendations on needed facilities. If utilization data indicate the need, the Advisory Council will give further consideration to a change of academic calendar.

INTER-STATE HIGHER EDUCATION RECIPROCITY

20. It is recommended that the Governor of Maryland take the initiative in contacting the Governors of neighboring states and the officials of the District of Columbia for the purpose of studying the feasibility of higher education reciprocity arrangements among a group of neighboring states.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Governor J. Millard Tawes in his letter of July 1, 1964, charging the Advisory Council with its responsibilities, suggested that "a master plan for the expansion of higher education be developed as soon as thoughtful study and deliberation permit." Since then the Council has undertaken the many special studies that are described herein and in its other reports. These have included such topics as faculty salaries, library services, manpower needs, reciprocity with institutions in other states, and projected population trends. Always the priorities for such independent studies were assigned because of special requests from the legislature or from other State agencies, or because of the urgency of the topics themselves. Always they were undertaken with the Executive and Legislative mandate in mind and with the knowledge that though they would contribute to master planning, a true master plan would need to be more than the simple sum of such parts.

PURPOSE OF A MASTER PLAN

Lest higher education develop in the State as a "crazy quilt" of needless duplications and unfortunate omissions, some type of cooperative strategic plan is necessary. Its aim must be the articulation of all of the segments of higher education in light of the integration of all of the strategic studies that can be brought to bear upon their problems. It should be designed to assure that all of the needs or demands for higher education will be met and to enable the individual institutions, agencies, and organizations to meet them.

The purpose of a master plan, then, is to help institutions to take appropriate initiative toward the attainment of State-wide objectives that are identified through the making of such a plan. Not all of the elements of a master plan are germane solely to a State-wide agency; they involve and must be developed by and through cooperative and creative action at every level.

MASTER PLAN CONCEPTS

This year, to prepare for the future development of such a plan, the Council conducted a survey and critical evaluation of existing state-wide master plans and produced tentative recommendations for guidance in devising Maryland's own.

Great care should be given to the delineation of the task itself as well as to the organization of the task forces for such a large undertaking. Distinctions, such as those between "needs" and "demands" must be clarified and data collection made uniform and usable. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of the implications of research and of innovation in such areas as curriculum design and methodology. Mere census-taking and extrapolating of enrollment figures are inadequate. The plan should employ time modules which are clear and consistent throughout its parts, and it should show clearly how commitment to recommendations in early phases of any program will affect later phases. Provision for continuing evaluation and review and for tactical planning within the strategic plan should be provided. Part of the plan should include a study of planning itself — the provisions and facilities for it and the strategies that should be adopted in the State regarding such matters as uniform data collection and processing, for example. Part of the function of a master plan should be to make better planning possible.

The analysis which was made also suggested a number of more specific concerns which ought not to be overlooked in Maryland's plan: the need for more sophisticated analysis of faculty characteristics, study of supply and demand and other vital matters regarding administrative personnel, the effects and control of sponsored research and sponsored instructional programs, the shared use of facilities between State and Federal agencies and the "system" of higher education, and the relationships with private or parochial institutions and the State's interest in them. Topics such as the philosophical basis for curriculum analysis, predictions or projections regarding the direction of growing fields of knowledge, and provisions for improving the quality of teaching should also be considered.

MASTER PLAN CONTENT

A major policy question is concerned with how inclusive Maryland's Master Plan for Higher Education should be. As part of the above analysis, a working outline of topics has been developed and will be refined during the year. It includes such major topic areas as the following:

I. Analysis of the need or demand for higher education in the State, including the attendance of individual students, the needs of the economy and society, and commitments to research and public service.

II. The structure and functions of higher education in the State, including present and recommended goals, State responsibility for regional and national goals, and an analysis of the present establishment as to the division of responsibilities or functions among its various institutions.

III. The coordination and control of higher education under the tri-partite system of the State, including analysis of the formal provisions, statutory and administrative, for the operation of the State system, as well as analysis of other intrastate forces that affect the determination of its policies; reciprocity and other inter-state agreements, and regional or national forces such as accrediting agencies or Federal and private foundation funding.

IV. Curriculum and program analysis, including State-wide offerings, geographic distribution, duplications and needs, and articulation between segments of the total educational system.

V. Faculty, administration and staff considerations both qualitative and quantitative, their characteristics, supply and demand, remuneration, and utilization.

VI. Students, their characteristics, and the many factors involved in enrollment analysis and projection, with attention to admission, graduation, retention and transfer policies and practices.

VII. The physical facilities, including a general inventory and evaluation of land holdings, buildings and building programs in light of all other considerations of the plan with detailed attention given to utilization and to pooled facilities. Special problems such as library services, or computer center sharing are included.

VIII. Costs and financing, with a discussion of the value of higher education to the individual and to the economy, should include analysis of expenditures and income along with projections of need and detailed analysis of planning and budgeting procedures.

IX. Recommendations which take all the above factors into account should include provision for the conduct of future planning itself as well as possible study of the integration of institutional master plans within the context of this strategic one.

During its brief history, the Advisory Council has already given careful consideration to a number of the topics outlined above which must be part of a comprehensive Master Plan for the State's system of higher education. But because the Advisory Council has made itself immediately responsive to requests of the Executive Branch of Government, the Resolutions of the Legislature, and the proposals of educational governing boards and individual institutions and agencies for specific studies and data, some more extensive investigations and more intensive studies in broader areas essential for the most complete State-wide higher educational master planning have, as a result, been necessarily postponed.

The Advisory Council desires to give priority to the development of the Master Plan itself. However, in planning its calendar of work, it is keenly aware of the many areas of development to which it must address itself. The workload for the coming year will include the regular annual surveys, the on-going studies as well as new studies that will develop as the result of specific requests and those to which the Council feels it must give special priority to develop the Master Plan for Maryland.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL EVIDENCE

The Advisory Council for Higher Education feels that enrollments and expenditures in higher education must be examined yearly in order to be cognizant of growth patterns in the various institutions both by level and type of control. Effective planning must be based on reliable data, in terms of actual numbers on the one hand, and trends or patterns of growth on the other.

The Advisory Council is particularly interested in establishing reporting rapport with all of the institutions in Maryland, both public and private, in an effort to collect uniform data on uniform forms so that the interests of all segments of higher education can be taken into account for planning. Steps have been taken in the past year toward uniform reporting by the institutions to the Advisory Council through lines of communication already established by the United States Office of Education. This endeavor will eliminate not only duplication of effort by the institutions, but also, the danger of inconsistencies in reporting to different agencies at different times and on different forms.

The following sections give information on the growth of students and expenditure of money in the past year.

FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENTS IN STATE-APPROVED MARYLAND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The enrollments in State-approved colleges and universities are listed in Table 1 by type, location, and percentage increase of full-time undergraduate enrollments. The greatest increase, as in 1965, was again in the public two-year colleges with a gain of 15.3% in enrollment. The rate of increase, however, has declined substantially in the two-year colleges this year. In no category this year was the rate of increase as great as the 1964-1965 rate of increase. The private two-year colleges increased enrollments 8.7% over 1965.

The four-year colleges increased their full-time undergraduate enrollments over 1965 by 10.9% in the public colleges, and 7.0% in the private colleges.

The total 1966 full-time undergraduate enrollment of 61,070 students is a 10.7% increase over 1965.

ENROLLMENT IN TYPES OF MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS

The undergraduate enrollment in Maryland's institutions by type and level is given in Table 2. The ratio of public to private undergraduate enrollment remained relatively stable in the last year, being 57.6% public to 42.4% private in part-time enrollments, and 74.8% public to 25.2% private in full-time enrollments. The total undergraduate enrollment in Maryland institutions is 68.9% public - 31.1% private, approximately the same percentage as last year.

FULL-TIME FRESHMEN IN MARYLAND COLLEGES

Table 3 shows that the total freshmen enrollment of 24,390 is a 4.0% increase over fall, 1965. This year, 31.3% of the full-time freshmen enrollment is in the two-year colleges, 28.6% in the University of Maryland, and 19.5% in the State colleges, for a total of 79.4% in public institutions. The two-year colleges for the first time have a greater combined freshmen enrollment than the University of Maryland. The University of Maryland decreased in actual number of full-time freshmen, while the State colleges increased.

The private colleges have 20.6% of the full-time freshman enrollments; 19.0% in four-year colleges, and 1.6% in two-year colleges. This figure represents a slight drop in actual number of freshmen over 1965.

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

Table 4 shows appropriations from Maryland General and Special Funds and Federal Funds for operating purposes of higher educational institutions for fiscal 1967. The general fund appropriations increased 23.3% over fiscal 1966, with a 22.6% increase in the total funds (including special and federal funds). The total amount of money for higher education from the general fund makes up 26.6% of the State educational budget for operating purposes.

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT

Graduate enrollment data for the current year had not been received by the State Department of Education in time to be included in this report. The figures for 1965, however, indicate that the total graduate enrollment in the State was 12,224 or 12.4% of the total enrollment in higher education.

PROJECTIONS

The Advisory Council for Higher Education recognizes that sound enrollment projections are basic to planning. Location of new facilities, and expansion of present facilities depend on the number of students expected in the new location or facility. The realization of the projected number of students is essential to achieving maximum efficiency in each institution.

The Advisory Council has undertaken an analysis of data, including the Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools Survey, in an effort to present a unified comprehensive set of projections for higher education in Maryland. The study is an important ingredient in effective organization of higher education.

In the 1965 report to the Governor and Legislature of Maryland, the Advisory Council presented a new set of projections for high school graduates continuing into higher education the fall following graduation. The Council has no basis for changing that projection at this time. The Advisory Council does feel, however, that while the percentages generated by the Council are substantially correct, the number of high school graduates reported to the Council may be an underestimate. Work done by the Division of Institutional Research of the University of Maryland presents an estimate of the number of high school seniors which is much higher than that presented by the State Department of Education. The projection of high school graduates is an important factor, and will be taken into account in the general study of enrollment projections.

TABLE 1

FULL TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT
AT STATE APPROVED MARYLAND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BY TYPE, LOCATION, AND PERCENTAGE INCREASE - FALL 1966

LOCAL UNIT	NAME OF INSTITUTION	FALL 1966						FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT					
		TWO-YEAR			FOUR-YEAR			PUBLIC			PRIVATE		
		FALL 1965	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	NUMBER	INCREASE	NUMBER	INCREASE	NUMBER	INCREASE	NUMBER	INCREASE	NUMBER
TOTAL		10486	15,3%	695	8,7%		35155	10,9%	14734	7,0%			
Allegany County	Allegany Community College	415	427	2,9									
	Frostburg State College	1598							1667	4,3			
Anne Arundel County	Anne Arundel Community College	447	410	-8,3									
	St. John's College	338									333	-1,5	
Baltimore City	Baltimore College of Commerce	267									332	24,3	
	Baltimore Hebrew College	44									38	-13,6	
	Baltimore Junior College	2048	2126	3,8									
	College of Notre Dame	780									794	1,8	
	Coppin State College	496							590	19,0			
	Eastern College	225									265	17,8	
	Johns Hopkins University	1690									1768	4,6	

FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT

FALL 1966

TWO-YEAR

PUBLIC

PRIVATE

FALL 1965

NUMBER

INCREASE

LOCAL
UNITNAME OF
INSTITUTIONLoyola
CollegeFALL
1965Maryland
InstituteFALL
1965Morgan State
CollegeFALL
1965Mount Saint
Agnes CollegeFALL
1965New Israel Rub-
inical CollegeFALL
1965Peabody
InstituteFALL
1965St. Mary's Seminary
and UniversityFALL
1965University of
BaltimoreFALL
1965Catonsville Com-
munity CollegeFALL
1965Essex Community
CollegeFALL
1965Goucher
CollegeFALL
1965Mt. Providence
Junior CollegeFALL
1965St. Charles
CollegeFALL
1965St. Peter's
CollegeFALL
1965Loyola
CollegeFALL
1966Maryland
InstituteFALL
1966Morgan State
CollegeFALL
1966Mount Saint
Agnes CollegeFALL
1966New Israel Rub-
inical CollegeFALL
1966Peabody
InstituteFALL
1966St. Mary's Seminary
and UniversityFALL
1966University of
BaltimoreFALL
1966Catonsville Com-
munity CollegeFALL
1966Essex Community
CollegeFALL
1966Goucher
CollegeFALL
1966Mt. Providence
Junior CollegeFALL
1966St. Charles
CollegeFALL
1966St. Peter's
CollegeFALL
1966Loyola
CollegeFALL
1966Maryland
InstituteFALL
1966Morgan State
CollegeFALL
1966Mount Saint
Agnes CollegeFALL
1966New Israel Rub-
inical CollegeFALL
1966Peabody
InstituteFALL
1966St. Mary's Seminary
and UniversityFALL
1966University of
BaltimoreFALL
1966Catonsville Com-
munity CollegeFALL
1966Essex Community
CollegeFALL
1966Goucher
CollegeFALL
1966Mt. Providence
Junior CollegeFALL
1966St. Charles
CollegeFALL
1966St. Peter's
CollegeFALL
1966Loyola
CollegeFALL
1966Maryland
InstituteFALL
1966Morgan State
CollegeFALL
1966Mount Saint
Agnes CollegeFALL
1966New Israel Rub-
inical CollegeFALL
1966Peabody
InstituteFALL
1966St. Mary's Seminary
and UniversityFALL
1966University of
BaltimoreFALL
1966Catonsville Com-
munity CollegeFALL
1966Essex Community
CollegeFALL
1966Goucher
CollegeFALL
1966Mt. Providence
Junior CollegeFALL
1966St. Charles
CollegeFALL
1966St. Peter's
CollegeFALL
1966Loyola
CollegeFALL
1966Maryland
InstituteFALL
1966Morgan State
CollegeFALL
1966Mount Saint
Agnes CollegeFALL
1966New Israel Rub-
inical CollegeFALL
1966Peabody
InstituteFALL
1966St. Mary's Seminary
and UniversityFALL
1966University of
BaltimoreFALL
1966Catonsville Com-
munity CollegeFALL
1966Essex Community
CollegeFALL
1966Goucher
CollegeFALL
1966Mt. Providence
Junior CollegeFALL
1966St. Charles
CollegeFALL
1966St. Peter's
CollegeFALL
1966Loyola
CollegeFALL
1966Maryland
InstituteFALL
1966Morgan State
CollegeFALL
1966Mount Saint
Agnes CollegeFALL
1966New Israel Rub-
inical CollegeFALL
1966Peabody
InstituteFALL
1966St. Mary's Seminary
and UniversityFALL
1966University of
BaltimoreFALL
1966Catonsville Com-
munity CollegeFALL
1966Essex Community
CollegeFALL
1966Goucher
CollegeFALL
1966Mt. Providence
Junior CollegeFALL
1966St. Charles
CollegeFALL
1966St. Peter's
CollegeFALL
1966

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

LOCAL UNIT	NAME OF INSTITUTION	FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT					
		FALL 1965			FALL 1966		
		PUBLIC	NUMBER	INCREASE	PUBLIC	NUMBER	INCREASE
	Towson State College	2949				3752	27.2%
	Trinitarian College	26		22	-15.4%		
	University of Maryland (Baltimore County Campus Only)	0			677		
	Villa Julie College	172		241	40.1		
Carroll County	Western Maryland College	809				799	-1.2%
Charles County	Charles County Community College	99	158	59.6%			
Frederick County	Frederick Community College	180	199	10.6			
	Hood College	737				753	2.2
	St. Joseph's College	574				643	12.0
	Mt. St. Mary's College	819				849	3.7
Harford County	Harford Junior College	545	677	24.2			
Howard County	Woodstock College						HAD GRADUATE STUDENTS ONLY
Kent County	Washington College	616				624	1.3

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

LOCAL UNIT	NAME OF INSTITUTION	FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT					
		FALL 1965			FALL 1966		
		TWO-YEAR		FOUR-YEAR		PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Montgomery County	Columbia Union College	NUMBER	INCREASE	NUMBER	INCREASE		
	Montgomery Junior College	756					
	Xaverian College	2251	2586	14, 9%			
Prince George's County	Bowie State College	110		67	-39, 1%		
	Prince George's Community College	524				499	-4, 8%
	University of Mary- land (Excluding Balti- more County Campus)	862	1496	73, 5		23383	8, 0
St. Mary's County	St. Mary's College of Maryland	21652					
	Maryland State College	322	323	0, 3			
Somerset County	Hagerstown Junior College	708				697	-1, 6
	Salisbury State College	514	561	9, 1			
Washington County	Wicomico County	644				629	-2, 3

TABLE 2

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
 ENROLLED IN STATE APPROVED MARYLAND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES -
 FALL 1966 BY TYPE AND LEVEL OF INSTITUTION

	NUMBER OF STUDENTS			% OF TOTAL	
	TOTAL	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Total Undergraduates	92,284	63,614	28,670	68.9%	31.1%
Total Full-Time Undergraduate	61,070	45,641	15,429	74.8	25.2
Total Part-Time Undergraduate	31,214	17,973	13,241	57.6	42.4
<u>TWO-YEAR COLLEGES</u>					
Full-Time Students	11,181	10,486	695	94.0	6.0
Part-Time Students	6,958	6,808	150	97.8	2.2
<u>FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES</u>					
Full-Time Students	49,889	35,155	14,734	70.5	29.5
Part-Time Students	24,256	11,165	13,091	46.0	54.0
<u>State Colleges*</u>					
Full-Time Students	11,095	11,095	-	-	-
Part-Time Students	727	727	-	-	-
<u>University of Maryland</u>					
Full-Time Students	24,060	24,060	-	-	-
Part-Time Students	10,438	10,438	-	-	-
<u>Private Institutions</u>					
Full-Time Students	14,734	-	14,734	-	-
Part-Time Students	13,091	-	13,091	-	-

*Includes Morgan State College and Maryland State College

SOURCE: Based on reports on file at Maryland State Department of Education.

TABLE 3

FULL-TIME FRESHMAN ENROLLMENTS AT
 STATE APPROVED MARYLAND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
 BY TYPE - FALL 1966, WITH PERCENT CHANGE OVER FALL 1965

	Full-Time Freshman Enrollment			Percent of Total Fall Full-Time Freshman Enrollment	
	Fall 1965	Fall 1966	Percent Change	1965	1966
TOTAL	23,456	24,390	4.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<u>PUBLIC</u>					
Two-Year Colleges	6,557	7,637	16.5%	28.0%	31.3%
State Colleges*	4,275	4,759	11.3%	18.2%	19.5%
University of Maryland	7,514	6,983	-7.1%	32.0%	28.6%
<u>PRIVATE</u>					
Two-Year Colleges	352	392	11.4%	1.5%	1.6%
Four-Year Colleges	4,758	4,619	-2.9%	20.3%	19.0%

*Includes Morgan State College and Maryland State College

Source: Based on Reports on File at Maryland State Department of Education

TABLE 4

STATE OF MARYLAND
APPROPRIATIONS FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION SHOWING ALLOCATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION OPERATING PURPOSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967
WITH PERCENTAGE INCREASE OVER FISCAL YEAR 1966

ITEM	GENERAL FUND			TOTAL*		
	1966	1967	Percent Increase	1966	1967	Percent Increase
Morgan State College	\$ 3,126,123	\$ 3,387,684	8.4	\$ 5,069,615	\$ 6,019,732	18.7
Bowie State College	801,783	980,016	22.2	998,751	1,269,893	27.1
Coppin State College	763,612	991,645	29.9	831,721	1,117,067	34.3
Frostburg State College	1,787,374	2,084,666	16.6	2,407,401	2,871,307	19.3
Salisbury State College	912,851	1,131,450	23.9	1,153,383	1,452,349	25.9
Towson State College	2,819,132	4,056,324	43.9	3,737,270	5,555,778	48.7
St. Mary's College of Maryland	351,699	509,111	44.8	597,333	799,534	33.9
University of Maryland and State Board of Agriculture:						
Administration	1,325,647	1,578,811	19.1	1,705,337	2,020,893	18.5
Libraries	1,365,382	1,721,822	26.1	1,394,542	1,753,035	25.7
Instruction - College Park	8,761,644	10,322,885	17.8	14,845,207	17,936,757	20.8
Instruction - Baltimore	3,160,221	3,792,299	20.0	4,444,025	5,225,025	17.6
University Hospital	4,777,085	5,766,147	20.7	10,765,867	12,351,871	14.7
Research	2,827,180	3,137,739	11.0	3,733,498	4,045,730	8.4
Extension Education	1,786,215	1,865,315	4.4	2,943,535	3,122,554	6.1
Public Services	1,470,368	1,611,026	9.6	1,765,086	1,931,528	9.4
Physical Plant Maintenance and Operation	5,723,650	6,505,799	13.7	6,220,018	7,084,451	13.9
Student Services	674,573	784,371	16.2	944,363	1,082,861	14.7
General Expenses	526,961	606,848	15.2	618,363	698,250	12.9
Maryland State College of Princess Anne	869,068	1,090,187	25.4	1,271,525	1,559,994	22.7
Baltimore County Branch	410,204	1,211,360	195.3	410,204	1,384,060	237.4
Appropriations to State Department of Education -						
Junior Colleges	2,096,325	4,032,600	92.4	2,096,325	4,032,600	92.4
State Scholarship Board	1,004,246	1,934,030	92.6	1,004,246	1,934,030	92.6
Board of Trustees - State Colleges	78,627	102,129	29.9	78,627	102,129	29.9
Advisory Council for Higher Education	77,654	197,480	154.3	77,654	197,480	154.3
Maryland Higher Education Loan Corp.	93,640	102,102	9.0	93,640	102,102	9.0
Sub-Total	48,241,594	59,503,816	23.3	69,857,539	\$5,651,010	22.6
Other Public Education	150,961,962	164,543,424	9.0	164,630,190	200,848,544	22.0
TOTAL	199,203,556	224,047,240	12.5	234,487,729	286,499,554	22.2

*Includes General, Special, and Federal Funds

Source: Based on the Fiscal Digest of the State of Maryland for Fiscal Years 1966, 1967.

CHAPTER V

1966 POST-HIGH SCHOOL PLANS OF SENIORS IN MARYLAND SCHOOLS SURVEY

The Advisory Council for Higher Education feels that all phases of post-high school education must be effectively planned for — terminal and technical, as well as academic. In an effort to determine the demand for post-high school education, and how Maryland's citizens might better be served, a questionnaire of plans of high school seniors was devised in 1965 for completion by all seniors in the State — public and private. The survey not only asked about student plans for attending degree-granting institutions by state and level, but also asked about student plans for business schools, nursing schools, technical and trade schools, and others. Those students not planning to continue their education were asked the reasons for not continuing. In the case of those students who would continue school with financial aid, they were asked what type school they would attend.

This survey proved so successful in its first year, that it was recommended by the Committee on Enrollment Projections, and accepted by the Advisory Council, that the survey be continued for a sufficient number of years to establish trend data for use in making comprehensive enrollment projections. The second annual study was conducted this year with the cooperation of the State Department of Education and the Council on High School and College Relations.

The survey this year included 42,941 seniors — 38,264 in public school, and 4,677 seniors in Catholic and private schools. The number surveyed represented over 90% of the seniors in the State in the Spring of 1966.

INTEREST AND PLANS

Table 5 shows that 32,183 or 74.9%* of the seniors surveyed said they were interested in continuing some form of post-high school education. In the county break-down, the interest ranged from 52.8% in Garrett County to 85.1% in Montgomery County. The table also shows that 28,213

*In computing percentages, all State percents are based on the total number of seniors surveyed in the State (42,941). All county percents are based on the total number of students surveyed in the county (see Table 5).

(65.7%) students had definite plans to attend some form of post-high school education — including community and four-year colleges, business school nursing schools, and technical and trade schools. The percent of seniors with definite plans to attend ranged from 39.8% in Garrett County to 81.4% in Montgomery County.

PLANS FOR MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS

The students with definite plans for continuing post-high school education were asked to name a specific institution, as well as indicate its type and location. Tables 6, 7, and 8 show the selections, by county, of the seniors for those institutions located in Maryland. These institutions are separated into three categories — public four-year colleges, public two-year colleges, and independent colleges. It can be seen that the counties ranged from a low of 7.7% of the seniors in Garrett County, to a high of 25.6% of the seniors in Somerset County, with a State total of 8,126 (18.9%) seniors going to State public four-year colleges. Of the students surveyed, the percent going to public two-year colleges ranged from none in Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne, Somerset, and Worcester Counties to 21.3% in Harford County. The State total going to public two-year colleges was 4,593 (10.7%) seniors. It is significant that those counties with no substantial selection by students for community colleges are those counties in which there has been no community college opportunity afforded to the students. With the opportunity offered by Chesapeake College on the Eastern Shore, undoubtedly more and more students will seek this two-year program. Selection for the independent colleges ranged from 0.97% in Allegany County to 7.01% in Baltimore City with a State total of 1,946 (4.53%) seniors.

NON-DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS IN MARYLAND

Table 9 indicates the selection by the students of business schools, nursing schools and technical or trade schools located in Maryland. This table also shows that 3,637 seniors (8.4%) selected this kind of education with a low of 2.2% in Montgomery County, and a high of 14.9% in Anne Arundel County.

PLANS FOR POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION IN OTHER STATES BY MARYLAND SENIORS

As can be seen in Table 10, 7,899 Maryland students (18.4%) planned to attend institutions in states outside of Maryland. Of the total number of students, 222 (0.5%) planned to attend schools in Delaware, 664 (1.5%) in the District of Columbia, 135 (0.3%) in New Jersey, 818 (1.9%) in

Pennsylvania, 676 (1.6%) in Virginia, 346 (0.8%) in West Virginia, and 5,038 (11.7%) in other states. The individual counties ranged from a low of 7.1% in Frederick County, to a high of 34.6% in Montgomery County. The location of the county in relation to the neighboring state had a positive effect on the number of students from that county attending institutions in the neighboring state.

SELECTION OF TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER STATES BY MARYLAND SENIORS

Table 11 indicates the type of institutions in other states selected by the students. This Table shows that 603 students (1.4%) selected community colleges, 5,570 students (13.0%) selected four-year colleges, 552 students (1.3%) selected business schools, 174 (0.4%) selected nursing schools and 665 (1.5%) selected technical or trade schools. The indication from the selection of schools is that the majority of these institutions are privately as opposed to publicly supported.

STUDENTS NOT PLANNING TO CONTINUE POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

The plans of those seniors not planning to continue their education were surveyed, as well as the reasons the students were not planning to attend school.

Of the total seniors surveyed, 5,105 (11.9%) planned on entering the armed services this year. This ranged from a low of 6.4% in Montgomery County to a high of 22.5% in Queen Annes County. The survey also indicated that 6,569 seniors (15.3%) had already secured a full-time job. The per cent securing jobs ranged from 8.3% in Calvert County to a high of 29.1% in Carroll County. Of those students with full-time jobs, 4,504 (10.5%) said the job was their choice for their life-time occupation. The choice of a life-time job ranged from 5.5% in Somerset County to a high of 20.3% in Carroll County (Table 12).

Table 13 indicates the reasons students are not attending post-high school education. The largest group of students (4,717 or 11.0%) were not interested in attending; the next largest groups were 2,840 (6.6%) students who said further education is not required in their chosen work, and 2,504 (5.8%) seniors who reported insufficient funds.

VALIDITY

The experience over the two years of the survey has given reason to have strong confidence in the validity and reliability of the instrument's

capacity to assess the actual plans of the Maryland high school seniors. Items such as the plans to attend certain institutions, and the first time enrollments in those institutions from the county have a high correlation. No evidence exists which casts doubt on the validity of the survey.

The data given above are a sample of more complete information which will be contained in a report dealing with the plans of the 1966 Maryland high school seniors. This report will be available later this year, containing additional information on the students by type of course, grades, and the educational experience of the student's father.

TABLE 5
1966 POST-HIGH SCHOOL PLANS
OF SENIORS IN MARYLAND SCHOOLS

	Percent of Students Interested in Continuing Education Beyond High School	Percent of Students With Definite Plans to Continue Some Form of Post-High School Education	Total Number of Students Responding to Survey
STATE TOTAL	74.9	65.7	42941
Allegany	67.0	55.2	1331
Anne Arundel	72.4	56.3	2840
Baltimore	75.4	67.6	7756
Calvert	76.8	66.7	225
Caroline	65.6	45.2	305
Carroll	63.8	51.0	525
Cecil	64.1	53.2	555
Charles	67.0	56.5	579
Dorchester	66.1	53.6	392
Frederick	53.7	42.3	971
Garrett	52.8	39.5	299
Harford	76.0	67.2	1121
Howard	77.2	62.4	654
Kent	67.2	53.4	174
Montgomery	65.1	51.4	6562
Prince Georges	76.7	70.0	5753
Queen Annes	65.5	49.5	200
St. Marys	72.6	60.2	500
Somerset	66.1	55.5	274
Talbot	65.7	55.3	262
Washington	55.5	45.4	1351
Wicomico	79.9	64.9	676
Worcester	71.9	66.9	299
Baltimore City	76.5	65.3	5971

TABLE 6

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
 SELECTING FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES IN MARYLAND
 AS A FIRST CHOICE, BY COLLEGE AND
 COUNTY OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

STATE TOTAL	11.4	0.2	0.4	1.2	0.5	1.9	0.4	0.3	2.6	18.9
Allegany	2.6	0.1	0.1	11.7	0	0	0	0	0.2	14.7
Anne Arundel	10.1	1.0	0.3	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.5	0.1	2.3	18.1
Baltimore	11.8	0	0	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.3	0.1	5.2	18.9
Calvert	2.2	1.8	1.3	0.9	1.3	4.4	0.4	1.8	1.3	15.4
Caroline	4.6	0	0	0.3	5.9	2.0	2.6	0.3	0	15.7
Carroll	6.7	0.1	0	1.5	0	0	0.4	0.2	1.5	10.3
Cecil	5.1	0	0	0.2	0	0.2	1.9	0.2	1.5	9.1
Charles	3.1	0.7	0.4	0	1.0	3.1	0	0	1.0	9.3
Dorchester	2.3	4.1	0.5	1.5	4.3	1.8	2.3	0	1.8	18.6
Frederick	7.1	0	0	1.3	0.2	0.1	0.4	0	1.2	10.4
Garrett	1.7	0	0	6.0	0	0	0	0	0	7.7
Harford	5.9	0.1	0	1.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.2	2.2	11.4
Howard	11.6	0	0.5	0.9	0.5	1.4	0.3	0.2	2.3	17.6
Kent	10.9	0	0	0	4.6	1.2	2.8	0	1.7	21.3
Montgomery	18.0	0	0	1.0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.9	20.1
Prince George	18.9	0.2	0	1.4	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	1.0	22.9
Queen Anne	2.5	2.5	0	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.0	0	0.5	9.5
Saint Mary	8.2	0.2	0	0	0.4	1.6	0	11.6	2.2	24.2
Somerset	4.0	4.0	0	0.4	6.6	4.0	6.2	0	0.4	25.6
Talbot	9.5	1.9	0.4	0	4.2	2.7	2.3	1.2	1.5	23.7
Washington	4.1	0	0	2.0	0.1	0	0	0	1.7	8.0
Wicomico	6.8	0.4	0	0.3	2.7	2.1	5.8	0.3	1.5	19.8
Worcester	3.0	3.3	0	3.3	4.0	1.7	1.7	1.3	0.3	15.7
Baltimore City	9.1	0	1.8	0.2	0.5	6.5	0.1	0	4.0	22.3
	University of Maryland	Bowie State	Coppin State	Frostburg State	Maryland State	Morgan State	Salisbury State	St. Mary's of Maryland *	Towson State	TOTAL

* Included in this table as a two-year institution in transition to a four-year college

TABLE 7

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
SELECTING PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN MARYLAND
AS A FIRST CHOICE, BY COLLEGE AND
COUNTY OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

STATE TOTAL	0.3	0.7	2.4	1.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.7	2.7	1.3	10.7
Allegany	10.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.1
Anne Arundel	0	9.9	0.5	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.7
Baltimore	0	0	1.8	4.9	0	3.1	0	0	0.4	0	0	10.2
Calvert	0	0	0	0	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	4.4
Caroline	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.7
Carroll	0	0	0.7	1.0	0	0	0.9	0.1	0	0	0	2.7
Cecil	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.8	0	0	3.8
Charles	0	0	0	0	10.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.7
Dorchester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.0	0.7	0	0.1	0	9.8
Garrett	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
Harford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21.3	0	0	21.3
Howard	0	0	0.2	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	5.8
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.0	0	17.1
Prince George	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	9.9	11.0
Queen Anne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Mary	0	0	0	0.2	0.6	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	1.0
Somerset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.1	0	0	0	10.1
Wicomico	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	0.9
Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	0	0	9.9	0.7	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	10.9
	Allegany Community College											
	Anne Arundel Community College											
	Baltimore Junior College											
	Catonsville Community College											
	Charles County Community College											
	Essex Community College											
	Frederick Community College											
	Hagerstown Junior College											
	Harford Community College											
	Montgomery Junior College											
	Prince George's Community College											
	TOTAL											

TABLE 8

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
SELECTING INDEPENDENT COLLEGES IN MARYLAND
AS A FIRST CHOICE, BY COLLEGE AND
COUNTY OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

STATE TOTAL	0.1	0	0.2	0.1	0	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.4	0	0.1	0.2
Allegany	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.4	0	0	0.3
Baltimore	0.2	0	0.6	0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.7	1.0	0.7	0	0.2	0.2
Calvert	0.9	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	0.4	0	0.4	0	0	0
Caroline	1.0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.3
Carroll	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.9	0	0.1	0.6
Cecil	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.3	0	0.2	0
Charles	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0	0	0.3
Dorchester	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0.5	0	0.3	0.5
Frederick	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0.3	0	0	0.6
Garrett	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0.3	1.3	0	0	0	0	0.3
Harford	0	0	0.2	0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0	0.1	0
Howard	0.5	0	1.1	0	0	0.2	0.3	0.6	0	0.5	0	0.3	0.2
Kent	0.6	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	0.6	0.6	0	0.6	1.2
Montgomery	0	0	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0.1	0	0	0.2
Prince George	0	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0.3	0	0.1	0	0	0
Queen Anne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	1.0	0	0.5	1.0
Saint Mary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.6	0	0.2	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	0.7	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	1.2	0	0.4	0	0	0.7
Washington	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	0.4	0.1	0.1	0	0	0.4
Wicomico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	0.2	0.4	0	0	0.3
Worcester	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0.3	0	0.3	0
Baltimore City	0.2	0	0.2	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.7	0.9	0.5	0	0.4	0.2
	Baltimore College of Commerce	Baltimore Hebrew College	Notre Dame of Maryland	Columbia Union	Eastern College	Goucher College	Hood College	Johns Hopkins University	Loyola College	Maryland Institute	Mt. Providence Junior College	Mt. St. Agnes	Mt. St. Marys

TABLE 8 (CONT.)

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
 SELECTING INDEPENDENT COLLEGES IN MARYLAND
 AS A FIRST CHOICE, BY COLLEGE AND
 COUNTY OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

STATE TOTAL	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	1.1	0.2	0.2	0.4	0	4.5
Allegany	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.4	0	1.0
Anne Arundel	0	0.2	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	1.8	0	0.3	0.7	0	4.9
Baltimore	0	0.2	0.4	0	0	0	0	2.4	0.7	0.3	0.5	0	5.1
Calvert	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.9	0	4.0
Caroline	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.7	0.7	0	3.9
Carroll	0	0.2	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.8	0	5.4
Cecil	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0.5	0	0	2.7
Charles	0	0	0	0.2	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.2	2.1
Dorchester	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0	3.3
Frederick	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.7	0	2.8
Garrett	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	3.0
Harford	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0.6	0	2.1
Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0	6.4
Kent	0	0	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	5.5
Montgomery	0	0.1	0	0.1	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.3	0	2.2
Prince George	0	0.1	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0.1	0.3	0	1.5
Queen Anne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.0
Saint Mary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	1.6
Somerset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.1	0	2.6
Talbot	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.4	0	4.2
Washington	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.4	0	1.8
Wicomico	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.7	1.0	0	3.4
Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	1.3	0.3	3.3
Baltimore City	0	0.1	0.3	0	0.1	0	0	2.6	0.5	0.1	0.2	0	7.0
	Ner Israel	Peabody Institute	St. Charles College	St. Johns College	St. Josephs College	St. Marys Seminary	St. Peters College	University of Baltimore	Villa Julie Junior College	Washington College	Western Maryland College	Xavierian College	TOTAL

TABLE 9

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
SELECTING POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION IN MARYLAND
INSTITUTIONS OTHER THAN COMMUNITY OR FOUR-YEAR
COLLEGES, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL AND COUNTY OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

	Business School	Nursing School	Technical or Trade School	Other
STATE TOTAL	3.6	1.4	2.6	0.8
Allegany	8.0	1.9	4.3	0.7
Anne Arundel	4.7	1.2	2.7	1.1
Baltimore	5.0	1.7	3.8	1.3
Calvert	6.1	1.8	3.1	2.2
Caroline	1.6	1.0	2.0	0.7
Carroll	4.7	1.6	7.6	0.8
Cecil	2.7	1.7	3.1	1.2
Charles	1.2	1.4	1.4	0.3
Dorchester	3.1	1.8	2.0	0.5
Frederick	3.3	1.2	2.0	0.7
Garrett	5.0	1.3	3.7	0
Harford	3.5	1.7	4.3	0.8
Howard	3.5	2.1	5.5	0.6
Kent	0.6	1.1	2.9	0.6
Montgomery	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.4
Prince Georges	1.6	0.9	1.9	0.6
Queen Annes	2.5	3.5	4.0	0.5
St. Marys	2.2	0.8	2.2	2.0
Somerset	7.3	3.3	2.6	1.1
Talbot	1.1	3.8	1.5	0.8
Washington	3.0	1.7	0	0.1
Wicomico	3.3	2.4	5.3	1.6
Worcester	3.7	2.3	6.4	0.3
Baltimore City	5.1	2.1	2.4	0.9

TABLE 10

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
SELECTING ALL TYPES OF POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
IN OTHER STATES AS A FIRST CHOICE, BY STATE AND
COUNTY OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

STATE TOTAL	0.5	1.5	0.3	1.9	1.6	0.8	11.7	18.4
Allegany	0	0.8	0	1.1	0.8	4.0	6.4	13.0
Anne Arundel	0.4	1.2	0.2	1.8	2.0	0.7	9.2	15.5
Baltimore	0.4	1.0	0.6	2.7	2.1	0.6	8.5	15.9
Calvert	0	3.9	0	0.4	0.9	0.4	17.5	23.2
Caroline	4.3	0.3	0.3	2.6	1.0	0	10.8	19.3
Carroll	0.1	1.3	0	0.5	1.1	0.7	9.8	13.5
Cecil	7.5	0.5	0.3	2.7	0.5	1.9	11.3	24.8
Charles	0	0.9	0	0.5	1.6	1.6	19.5	24.0
Dorchester	2.6	0.5	0	0.3	2.6	0.5	13.0	19.4
Frederick	0.1	0.5	0.2	2.1	1.2	1.1	1.9	7.1
Garrett	0	0	0	1.3	2.7	4.3	7.4	15.7
Harford	0.6	0.1	0.1	1.7	1.1	0.4	11.1	15.1
Howard	0	1.1	0.2	1.2	0.9	1.5	9.9	14.8
Kent	3.4	0	0	1.1	0.6	0.6	11.5	17.2
Montgomery	0.2	3.0	0.6	3.2	2.2	1.3	24.2	34.6
Prince George	0.1	3.3	0.2	1.1	1.2	0.5	16.0	22.3
Queen Anne	5.5	0.5	0	1.5	2.0	0.5	7.5	17.5
St. Marys	0.2	2.6	0.2	0.8	1.6	0.8	14.0	20.2
Somerset	2.6	0.7	0	1.8	1.8	0	5.8	12.8
Talbot	3.1	0.4	0.4	1.9	5.0	0.4	7.6	18.7
Washington	0.3	0.7	0.2	2.3	2.1	2.0	8.1	15.6
Wicomico	1.9	0.9	0.1	1.5	2.2	0.3	13.6	20.6
Worcester	4.7	1.0	0	0.7	4.3	1.0	9.7	21.4
Baltimore City	0.2	0.8	0.2	1.4	0.8	0.1	6.0	9.6
Delaware		District of Columbia	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Virginia	West Virginia	All Others	TOTAL

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
SELECTING POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION IN OTHER
STATES, BY TYPE OF EDUCATION AND COUNTY OF HIGH
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

	Community College	Four-Year College	Business School	Nursing School	Technical or Trade School	Other
STATE TOTAL	1.4	13.0	1.3	0.4	1.5	0.8
Allegany	3.1	5.0	0.8	0.3	2.5	1.4
Anne Arundel	1.1	9.4	0.7	0.3	3.1	0.9
Baltimore	1.4	12.7	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.7
Calvert	1.3	5.7	7.0	1.3	6.6	1.3
Caroline	1.3	6.9	4.6	1.3	4.3	1.0
Carroll	0.8	5.5	1.0	0.6	1.6	1.1
Cecil	1.7	12.1	5.5	0.9	3.6	1.0
Charles	0.2	15.2	5.0	1.2	1.4	1.0
Dorchester	2.8	10.5	3.6	0.3	2.3	0
Frederick	0.6	3.4	1.3	0.2	1.3	0.2
Garrett	4.0	7.0	0.7	0.3	3.0	0.7
Harford	1.2	10.0	1.0	0.3	1.5	1.2
Howard	1.5	10.4	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.9
Kent	1.1	5.2	4.0	2.3	3.4	1.1
Montgomery	1.8	29.0	0.9	0.6	1.3	1.0
Prince Georges	1.6	12.8	3.5	0.7	2.9	0.8
Queen Annes	5.5	5.5	2.5	1.0	1.5	1.5
St. Marys	1.4	9.8	3.8	0.6	3.4	1.2
Somerset	1.1	3.3	4.4	1.5	1.5	1.1
Talbot	2.7	12.2	3.8	0	0	0
Washington	0.7	11.9	0.7	0.4	1.5	0.4
Wicomico	3.1	10.5	3.3	0.4	2.7	0.6
Worcester	7.0	7.0	4.3	0	2.7	0.3
Baltimore City	0.6	7.8	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.5

TABLE 12
1966 POST-HIGH SCHOOL PLANS OF
SENIORS IN MARYLAND SCHOOLS

	Percent of Students Planning on Entering Armed Service	Percent of Students Who Already Have Secured A Full-Time Job	Percent of Students Whose Job is Their Choice For Their Lifetime Occupation
STATE TOTAL	11.9	15.3	10.5
Allegany	20.4	13.1	7.1
Anne Arundel	10.1	18.8	12.5
Baltimore	11.8	13.6	9.7
Calvert	18.0	8.3	5.7
Caroline	17.0	14.8	11.1
Carroll	16.8	29.1	20.3
Cecil	13.7	16.1	12.0
Charles	11.9	24.5	15.9
Dorchester	15.6	18.1	11.0
Frederick	16.7	28.2	18.8
Garrett	17.4	25.1	14.7
Harford	12.9	13.8	9.7
Howard	20.3	16.8	12.1
Kent	20.1	23.6	12.6
Montgomery	6.4	10.2	7.1
Prince Georges	10.3	17.4	12.5
Queen Annes	22.5	21.0	11.0
St. Marys	12.6	17.8	12.6
Somerset	14.6	8.8	5.5
Talbot	15.6	24.0	11.5
Washington	18.2	22.4	13.9
Wicomico	18.6	13.9	7.2
Worcester	12.4	9.4	7.4
Baltimore City	11.6	13.7	9.6

TABLE 13

PERCENT OF 1966 SENIORS GIVING REASONS FOR NOT ATTENDING
SCHOOL BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL, BY REASON AND COUNTY
OF HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

STATE TOTAL	11.0	5.5	5.8	5.4	0.2	0.5	6.6	0.7	0.5	5.3
Allegany	15.9	7.7	8.6	6.8	0.3	0.9	6.5	1.1	0.8	7.3
Anne Arundel	12.7	6.4	6.5	6.1	0.2	0.7	8.3	0.9	0.7	7.5
Baltimore	11.3	5.6	5.6	5.1	0.1	0.5	7.9	0.7	0.4	4.7
Calvert	11.8	5.7	4.8	3.1	0.4	0.4	3.1	0.4	0	7.9
Caroline	21.3	10.5	8.5	12.8	0	0	7.2	1.0	2.0	6.6
Carroll	18.0	5.7	8.7	8.5	0	0.4	8.9	1.2	0.1	7.6
Cecil	17.9	11.6	7.2	9.4	0	1.2	7.4	0.7	0.2	6.5
Charles	17.6	7.6	6.9	5.9	0.3	0.7	9.0	0.7	0.2	4.7
Dorchester	21.7	9.4	6.1	4.3	0	1.8	4.6	0.5	0.8	5.6
Frederick	23.6	8.0	6.7	10.9	0.4	0.4	11.8	1.4	0.3	7.0
Garrett	27.1	11.7	8.4	10.4	0	0	10.0	2.7	0.3	7.0
Harford	8.6	7.0	6.0	6.5	0.4	0.6	7.0	0.5	0.4	5.3
Howard	10.9	6.0	6.7	6.0	0.3	0.6	8.3	1.1	0.3	6.7
Kent	17.2	9.8	11.5	10.3	0.6	0	7.5	1.1	0	8.6
Montgomery	5.5	3.0	2.5	3.1	0.1	0.3	3.5	0.3	0.2	2.7
Prince Georges	9.3	5.1	4.0	5.3	0.2	0.7	7.2	0.6	0.3	3.7
Queen Annes	16.5	9.0	8.5	6.0	1.0	0.5	5.5	0.5	1.5	9.5
St. Marys	12.8	5.2	7.2	7.8	0.4	1.2	7.0	1.6	0.2	6.0
Somerset	14.2	14.6	8.0	5.1	0	0.4	4.4	0.4	0.4	7.7
Talbot	20.6	9.2	7.3	4.6	0	1.9	10.3	1.5	0.8	7.3
Washington	19.7	9.0	7.2	8.2	0.2	0.7	7.3	1.0	0.5	7.7
Wicomico	9.5	7.4	8.0	5.9	0.1	1.2	5.6	1.3	0.9	6.5
Worcester	9.0	5.0	4.0	6.4	0.7	0	2.7	0.7	0	5.4
Baltimore City	8.7	4.3	7.6	4.7	0.2	0.4	5.8	0.4	0.7	6.3
	Not Interested	Poor Grades	Insufficient Funds	Marriage	Health Reasons	No Suitable Program in Maryland	Not Required in Chosen Work	Do Not Want to Attend Commuting School	Cannot Attend School of My Choice	Other

NOTE: Each student may give more than one reason.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE

On November 15, 1966, the Advisory Council, acting upon the recommendation of its Committee on Community Viewpoint, sponsored Maryland's first Governor's Conference on Higher Education. The Conference program which focused on the theme "Higher Education and the Economy of Maryland" provided a basis for stimulating presentations by outstanding speakers and guests as well as much needed two-way communication between Maryland's citizens and its system of higher education. The Conference was held at the Adult Education Center at the University of Maryland. The more than 275 persons taking part in the Conference represented a cross-cut of the community, as follows: business (20%), industry (20%), public services (25%), education (30%), and agriculture and miscellaneous (5%).

THE PROGRAM

The morning session of the Conference was keynote by a speech delivered by Mr. L. Mercer Smith, President of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore, Incorporated, on "What Business and Industry Expect from Higher Education." "Facts about Higher Education in Maryland" by Dr. Wesley N. Dorn, Director of the Advisory Council, provided a factual and informative basis for the workshop sessions that followed. These workshop sessions, under the leadership of Mr. Donald J. Shank, Dr. Furman L. Templeton, Dr. K. Brantley Watson, and Mr. Fred C. Wright, Jr., provided an opportunity for enlightened discussion of significant problems facing Maryland's economy and its system of higher education.

Dr. William Craig, Associate Deputy Commissioner of Education, United States Office of Education, addressed a luncheon session on "The Changing Role of Higher Education in our Economy." In this session, greetings were extended by Senator Daniel Brewster and from Spiro T. Agnew, Governor-Elect of Maryland.

A panel discussion, composed of the morning workshop leaders, under the chairmanship of Dr. G. Russell Tatum, synthesized many of the ideas developed in the morning workshops. The Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, addressed the afternoon gathering. His remarks highlighted recent progress of higher education in Maryland.

OUTCOMES

Among the outcomes realized by the Conference were: (1) Lines of communication were opened between higher education and the business and industrial community of Maryland; (2) The Advisory Council has received many valuable suggestions from participants, particularly in the area of manpower and program needs. As an immediate follow-up, the Council has established a steering committee composed of business and industrial leaders to undertake the study of manpower needs.

CHAPTER VII

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE AND COORDINATION

On the basis of its study over a two-year period, the Advisory Council for Higher Education unanimously recommends to the Governor and Legislature that a new State Board for Community Colleges be established, in order to complete the fundamental structure of the tri-partite system as an essential component of the State's Master Plan for Higher Education, and that any local board of education which wishes to be divested of its responsibility for community college governance be authorized to request appointment of a separate board of community college governance be authorized to request appointment of a separate board of community college trustees for its local unit.

One of the earliest studies undertaken by the Council was the question of the most appropriate structure for the one segment of public higher education operating under a State board having dual responsibilities, for both the community colleges and the kindergarten through twelfth grade. This Chapter discusses the reasons for this recommendation and provides additional detail on the recommendation itself.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRI-PARTITE SYSTEM AS THE FUNDAMENTAL STRUCTURE OF MARYLAND'S MASTER PLAN

The Advisory Council has recognized for some time that if the best interests of students in each segment of Maryland's tri-partite system of public higher education are to be served, then an efficient Master Plan must be developed in which each component of the system operates within a structure most appropriate for carrying out its distinctive purposes.

The Maryland Legislature has consistently moved to strengthen public higher education at a level separate from that of the public school system. Although Maryland has had public community colleges in one form or another as post-high school institutions since 1946, there was no specific chapter relating to these institutions in Maryland's laws for 15 years until 1961.

In 1960, a report of the State Board of Education (Frampton Report) took the position that "the administration of these junior colleges should be under the jurisdiction of the local boards of education." In 1961, however, the General Assembly enacted legislation providing that the community colleges should be governed by local boards of trustees

legally distinct from the local boards of education, although consisting of the same membership, thereby recognizing that these colleges were not mere extensions of grades K through 12.

For a number of years, the lay members of the State Board of Education served in a dual capacity with respect to the State Teachers Colleges, that is, as both the "Maryland State Board of Education" and the "Board of Trustees of the State Teachers Colleges." The Frampton Report referred to above proposed that these Teachers Colleges be converted as soon as feasible into general State Colleges, and that "a division of higher education be established under the supervision of an Assistant Superintendent in the State Department of Education." The Legislature did not provide authorization or funds for this expansion in the State Department of Education, and in 1963 enacted into law the recommendation of the Curlett Commission that a separate board of trustees be created for the State Colleges.

The State Board of Education has now proposed that the State Department of Education be expanded to include a division with responsibility for the community colleges. The Advisory Council has recommended that a separate State Board for Community Colleges be created, so that each segment of public higher education will have a board devoted exclusively to its interests. The Council has stressed on a number of occasions the importance of this structure as the one best suited in Maryland for its Master Plan for Higher Education. The Council feels that the passage of such legislation is one of the most important actions that this legislature can take to strengthen and complete the tri-partite system of public higher education.

THE CONCERN FOR SEPARATE BOARDS

In developing a similar recommendation on the governance and coordination of community colleges a year ago, the Council and two of its policy committees sought the viewpoints and advice of a number of groups and individuals, in addition to formulating the issues involved and gathering pertinent data. The hearings of the Senate and House Education Committees of the 1966 General Assembly also provided an opportunity for the expression of different points-of-view on the Council's recommendation.

Among those whose viewpoints were favorable to the separation of the community college governance and coordination from the public school system were:

1. COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS

In a ballot conducted by the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, two-thirds of those responding favored both a separate State board and separate local boards for community colleges. Less than one in ten favored the present arrangement of governance and coordination. This ballot brought responses from seventy percent of the total full-time faculty in Maryland's community colleges last year.

2. COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

The Maryland Council of Community College Presidents voted for the establishment of separate State and local boards for community colleges last year. This vote was reaffirmed in the past few months.

3. OUTSTANDING FIGURES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Council's recommendation for separate governance and coordination of the community colleges has been endorsed by such outstanding leaders of higher education in Maryland as the President of the Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Milton Eisenhower; the President of the University of Maryland, Dr. Wilson Elkins; the President of Goucher Colleges, Dr. Otto Kraushaar; and the President of St. John's College, Dr. Richard Weigle. In this connection, it should be noted that a number of the former members of the Curlett Commission of 1962 now favor the establishment of separate boards for the State's community colleges.

4. LAY GROUPS INTERESTED IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Support for separate boards for community colleges has come from the Maryland Branch of the American Association of University Women and the Legislative Committee of the Maryland County Commissioners Association.

5. A NUMBER OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN LARGER COUNTIES

The Boards of Education of Anne Arundel County, Baltimore County, and Montgomery County have taken official action in support of the Council's recommendation for separate community college boards.

6. THE 1966 HOUSE OF DELEGATES

A Bill embodying the present recommendations of the Advisory Council for separate community governance and coordination was passed by the 1966 Maryland House of Delegates by a vote of 85-17. No action could be taken in the Senate before the adjournment of the 1966 General Assembly.

No groups from outside the State have taken an explicit position on the Council's recommendations for Maryland's community college governance and coordination. However, a number of national and regional groups interested in higher education have pointed out certain principles having relevance to Maryland.

1. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

In a paper prepared for the Advisory Council, the Executive Director of the A. A. J. C., Dr. Edmund Gleazer, pointed out, "The identification of the community college with the public school system may well have been a necessary stage in the movement's growth. In recent years, however, it has been recognized that the community college must develop as an entity in itself, if it is to realize its full potential. Most states now recognize the community college as a part of higher education.... In fact, very few new community colleges are established today as an extension of the high school under the board of a school district. The community college is emerging as an element of higher education in its own right."

In addition, the Commission on Legislation of the A. A. J. C. has said: "The administration of the local junior college should not be combined with the administration of a high school or other educational unit.... It has been found that a junior college will best meet the needs of the local community when the control is under a local board for community colleges alone."

2. MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

In its Bulletin on "Junior Colleges and Community Colleges," the Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education points out, "A junior college within a public school system sometimes faces two disadvantages: that it will seem merely two more years of high school, and that it will lack the administrative and educational freedom its more advanced and specialized work requires. Either condition will limit its usefulness..."

Furthermore, the Chairman of this Commission, Dr. Albert Meder, Jr., has warned that "unless the two-year community college is set up as a part of American higher education, the whole enterprise is vain." Speaking before the Advisory Council's Committee on Role and Scope of Institutions, Dr. Meder expanded on this viewpoint, saying that it would "take an exceptional board" for the "board responsible for the public school system to convert itself into a board of trustees with respect to the community college and function from a quite different point of view." Dr. Meder also expressed his belief that "the burden of proof"

is on those who argue that a board concerned with K-through-12 will be "more concerned about the service that the community college gives to the students than separate boards for the community college." "The logical assumption," he asserted, "would be that a board that is concerned exclusively with the college will be more concerned about the college student than a board that has other responsibilities as well."

3. COMMENTS ON REGIONAL ACCREDITATION OF A MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

At Essex Community College, the Regional Accreditation Evaluation Team strongly favored the creation of an independent board for the community college. This firm position was taken even in circumstances where the Team clearly recognized that, at Essex Community College, "the administration and the Board of Trustees enjoy excellent relations. Administration is free from interference and unhampered in their activities. Mutual confidence and respect are evident." The Evaluation Team reported:

At a joint meeting of the (Middle States Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges Evaluation) Team, the administration (of Essex Community College) and the Board of Trustees, the dual role of the Essex Board was thoroughly discussed. In Maryland, the Board of Education serves also as the Board of Trustees for community colleges, with the Superintendent of Schools acting as Secretary of the Board. The advantages and disadvantages of this arrangement were gone into, as well as the probable fate of currently proposed legislation which would, if passed, set up an independent Board of Trustees for the community colleges in each county. The Team strongly favored an independent Board; the administration was understandably silent on the issue; the Board of Trustees was divided with its Chairman and several others in favor of an independent Board. Only one member of the Team, the representative of the Maryland State Education Department, favored the status quo.

In summary, it may be said that:

- (1) In general, those whose principal concern is in the area of higher education support the governance and coordination of community colleges separate from the public school system;
- (2) A number of groups and individuals whose major interest and responsibility are centered upon the public school system oppose a separate board for the community colleges.

(3) In general, independent commissions, study groups, and management consultant firms studying the problem, favor the governance and coordination of community colleges separate from the public school system.

In the past few years, no fewer than eleven states have established community college systems separate from their public school systems, and at least two others are seriously considering such a move at the present time. On the other hand, no state has moved in the opposite direction, placing a formerly separate community college system under the public school system. While it is true that no two states have identical needs and problems, the implications of this trend are difficult to ignore.

There has been a growing concern in Maryland over community college governance and coordination. Until recently, however, there has existed in the State no agency to whom this concern might properly have been expressed. Speaking to this problem, the President of the Montgomery County Board of Education has written stating that the absence of an official expression by a board of trustees to the State Department of Education does not mean satisfaction with the status quo. His letter states:

Under existing law the local board of education has no choice but to also be the board of trustees for the community college. Therefore, it would have served no purpose to ask for relief when the existing law does not allow for this provision....I know that there is considerable support from the Montgomery County and Prince George's County Board of Education for this proposed change.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

The Advisory Council considers the following principles to be fundamental to a sound structure for the governance and coordination of the State's community colleges and to the provision of increased opportunities for Maryland's college students.

1. MARYLAND'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE A LEGITIMATE PART OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The recognition of the community colleges as a full partner in the State's tri-partite system of public higher education is essential to the successful development both of these institutions and of the higher education system as a whole. This principle is enunciated in the laws of the State relating to community colleges, and in the 1965 and 1966 Reports of the Advisory Council for Higher Education.

The notion that Maryland's community colleges should be viewed as an extension of the secondary school as "grades 13 and 14" is likewise rejected by an overwhelming majority of community college administrative and faculty personnel, and members of their boards of trustees and advisory councils. The Advisory Council conducted a Survey on Community College Coordination among these individuals, showing that 95 percent of those responding believe these colleges should properly be "a part of higher education." Only one respondent per one hundred felt that they should be "a part of the public school system as grades 13 and 14."

2. STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION ARE IMPORTANTLY INTERRELATED

Despite statements of the State Board of Education to the contrary, the structure of governance and coordination of the community colleges is not a "very secondary" consideration. A first principle of sound management practice is that an organization must be structured according to the goals which it is to serve and the way in which it is to serve them. As stated in the Curlett Commission Report of 1962, "No organizational structure can guarantee quality of performance in higher education, but it can help provide an environment that will encourage academic achievement."

3. COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD FULFILL A DISTINCTIVE ROLE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The whole purpose of Maryland's particular tri-partite structure of public higher education is that each segment is intended to perform certain distinctive functions not performed by the others. In the case of the community colleges, their distinctive role involves special attention to community needs; the provision of two-year academic programs for students intending to transfer to four-year institutions for further study; the provision of terminal programs in appropriate fields; the provision of special opportunities for continuing education - all at relatively low cost to the students.

The distinctiveness of this role of the community colleges necessitates the development of special skills by those professional and lay individuals responsible for the colleges' operations.

4. MARYLAND'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE LOCALLY CONTROLLED

As an important part of their distinctive role, it is recognized that the pattern of community college education adopted in Maryland calls for control of these colleges at the local level, that is, by local boards of trustees. It is at this level, that the basic decisions on community college management must be made.

5. MARYLAND'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES REQUIRE STATE-WIDE LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION

The community colleges are, and will continue to be, the fastest-growing segment of Maryland's higher education system. In the five years since 1961, the full-time enrollment in Maryland's Community Colleges has more than tripled, growing from 3,404 to 10,486. In addition, these institutions enrolled this year some 6,808 part-time students. As the community colleges grow, there will be problems of developing appropriate curricula and program offerings, problems of obtaining qualified staff, suitable support, and adequate facilities, problems of improving two-way communication with the public, the local school systems and the various segments of higher education, and of meeting the particular needs of students and their communities. Furthermore, the goal of diversity requires a high degree of proficient coordination on a State-wide level to assure overall efficiency free of wasteful duplication.

THE REASONS FOR SEPARATE BOARDS

The present recommendations of the Advisory Council--that a new State Board for Community Colleges be established and that new local boards of community college trustees be established at the option of the present local boards of education--have been formulated to answer a basic question: What is the most appropriate structure for the governance and coordination of Maryland's community colleges? The task of the Council, then, has been to apply sound management principles to the subject of community college education, in the light of the particular purposes and problems of these colleges in Maryland.

Despite statements to the contrary, it is by no means necessary to demonstrate negligence or incompetence on the part of those now responsible for the community colleges. Nor does the Council have any intention of being critical of these particular individuals or boards. The primary concern of the Advisory Council is not the past development of the community colleges, but rather their growth and improvement in the years ahead.

1. FULL RECOGNITION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS HIGHER EDUCATION

It is evident that Maryland's community colleges are not yet fully recognized as a full partner in the State's system of higher education.

While many involved in the operation of these colleges do grant them this recognition, a different attitude still is evident in some quarters. For instance:

--a letter received from the State Department of Education argues that 'having the same Board govern the K-12 program and community college in each local school unit provides greater assurance of a consistent philosophy of public education within local jurisdiction. "

--a letter from the Superintendent of Washington County Schools states, "We consider the Hagerstown Junior College an integral part of the Washington County Public school system. We do not feel it should be a separate entity any more than any part of the school system. Therefore, our entire County staff work with it just as they do with the other divisions. Mr. Atlee Kepler, Junior College President, also has the status of a staff supervisor."

--letters received from two other local superintendents refer to the community colleges of their counties as "an integral part" of their counties' public school systems.

These statements serve to highlight a very basic problem: the community college should not be an "integral part" of the public school system, nor should it be subject to the same 'philosophy of public education' as grades K-12. It is precisely this danger which is warned against by the American Association of Junior Colleges and by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, whose Commission on Higher Education cautions that "a college does not fit easily into some controls and procedures which may work well in other parts of a school system." This problem is nicely put by Dr. Sigurd Rislov, Professor of Higher Education at Wayne State University:

If the community college is also the board of a kindergarten through twelfth grade program, the traditions, policies, practices, customs, folkways, etc., that have grown up around the elementary and secondary program cannot be ignored, even though the board may wish to do so in its dealings with the community college Even when a common school board makes a special effort to recognize higher education's objectives and policies as distinct from those of the kindergarten through twelfth grade, it meets with very limited success.

2. COMPLETION OF THE TRI-PARTITE SYSTEM OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

The Advisory Council has consistently supported the tri-partite structure of public higher education as adopted in Maryland. Two of the three parts of this system are now governed by boards whose unique responsibility is for a segment of higher education. Only the community colleges are left to boards whose primary interests are for other parts of public education. The establishment of separate State and local boards for the community colleges would complete the State's tri-partite structure.

3. THE NEED FOR GREATER STATE-LEVEL ATTENTION TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Advisory Council conducted a survey among the individuals concerned most directly with the operation of the State's community colleges: their top-level administrators, full-time faculty, members of their boards of trustees, and members of their advisory councils. This Survey on Community College Coordination revealed that there is an apparent need for a much greater degree of State-level leadership for these colleges. The Survey listed thirteen "responsibilities" and nine "services" which might be appropriate for a State-level coordinating agency to perform. A large majority of those responding to the Survey indicated their beliefs that all nine "services" and all but one of the "responsibilities" were, indeed, appropriate functions for such an agency.

The Survey presented a combined list of eighteen of these "responsibilities and services," and asked the respondents to indicate their opinions as to "how effective" each of these has been to date. A large majority of those expressing their opinions on these items felt that they had been "Not as Effective as Desired." On none of the eighteen responsibilities and services did a majority of the respondents feel that provision to date had been "Satisfactory."

4. INCREASED WORK-LOAD IN THE FUTURE

At both the State and local levels, the definite prospect is for an increased work load, both for community colleges and for the K-12 public school system. On the one hand, the expansion of the public school system is certain to result from the increase in population and additionally from the increased emphasis being placed on the development of kindergartens, adult study programs, and other undertakings. At the same time, the community college segment will expand at a greater rate than any other segment of public higher education, both through the growth of the present colleges and the addition of new ones. This growth is certain to place increased burdens upon the boards and administrators responsible for the community colleges.

Pressures of this increasing work-load cannot be ignored through reliance upon the presidents and professional staff of the community colleges. While it is true that a good community college board is not expected to undertake the "day to day management" of the colleges, nevertheless its members must devote time and effort in exercising leadership and developing policy. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools makes this point very clearly, noting, "Lack of time, or failure to take enough time for the work, is often the reason when a trustee proves inadequate."

The proposal of the State Board of Education for the creation of a new Division for Community Colleges in the State Department of Education speaks only to the point of staff support, but fails to take account of the important need for the undivided attention of a board responsible for community colleges.

5. NEED FOR GREATER IMPROVEMENTS IN QUALITY

Maryland's commitment to excellence in public higher education must extend to all its segments. While improvements have been made in the past, more is needed. Although some of Maryland's eleven community colleges have been in existence for nearly twenty years, only five of them have thus far qualified for regional accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The Advisory Council believes that a goal of regional accreditation within five years of establishment is not unrealistic. Indeed, the recent accreditation of Allegany Community College in three years after its establishment indicates that such a goal is reasonable for other colleges, given strong State and local leadership.

Similarly, graduates of some community colleges have been generally successful in continuing their education at four-year institutions; but the evidence does not indicate that this is true for graduates of all community colleges.

Ultimately, the quality of any educational institution depends upon the people involved, the students, faculty and administration. The Higher Education Commission of the Middle State Association warns that the disadvantages faced by a junior college within a public school system may result in "dampening student motivation and making it difficult to attract first rate faculty members and administrators."

A recent fourteen-month study conducted for the American Association of Junior Colleges discovered the following:

The [junior college] teachers' resentment overflow when they talk about the results of being wedded to the public

school system. The situation is particularly unhappy where junior colleges are controlled by the same board that oversees elementary and secondary education.

6. NEED FOR A SPECIAL PERSPECTIVE

The uniqueness of the role of Maryland's community colleges demands that those responsible for their governance and coordination develop a special perspective on their work. Community colleges are not universities or four-year colleges: consequently, they should not be governed by the same agencies that govern these institutions. Nor are the community colleges mere extensions of high school. Consequently, they should not be governed or coordinated as though they were.

The important role of the community colleges in post-secondary vocational technical education particularly demands a special perspective. These programs are not the same as the programs of either the public school system or the four-year college or university. Speaking to the fear that boards uniquely concerned with community colleges might ignore technical-vocational education, Dr. Albert Meder, Chairman of the Higher Education Commission of the Middle State Association, saw "no danger at all." To the contrary, he said that a "board concerned exclusively with the college" will be "more concerned about the needs of the constituent students than a board that has other responsibilities."

Dr. Meder also said that, for the same reason, separate community college boards would be in a better position to assure that the colleges maintained their local orientation, rather than becoming identical institutions across the State. The function of a separate State-wide board for community colleges would be only to coordinate and assist the efforts of the local boards and colleges.

7. NEED FOR ARTICULATION WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The retention of the community colleges within the public school system is an obstacle to the establishment of desirable relationships between these colleges and four-year colleges and universities. This is particularly important, since the community colleges are intended to prepare students for transfer to four-year institutions. At the present time, more than two-thirds of Maryland's community college students are enrolled in such transfer programs. By giving full recognition to the role of Maryland's community colleges as a part of higher education, the establishment of separate State and local boards would improve the relationships between this segment and the other segments of higher education. For the establishment of a "peer partner" relationship of the community colleges with not only public four-year colleges, but also private colleges, separate boards are desirable.

8. ARTICULATION WITH THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

It is argued that the present arrangement of boards with dual responsibility for community colleges and the K-12 public schools is necessary to provide articulation between these parts of education. The fallacy in this argument is that it assumes that community colleges require this articulation while other segments of higher education do not. In fact, articulation is important between the public school systems and all segments of higher education, not just the community colleges.

The only unique interest which the community colleges have in articulation with the public school system arises when the colleges have to share facilities in public school buildings. But this arrangement is clearly an expediency, which should be terminated as soon as the college is able to acquire its own distinctive facilities. And, for periods before such separate facilities are acquired, there is no reason why shared facilities might not be provided through contractual arrangements. This approach is currently used between the school systems and such agencies as park and recreation boards; its application to the community colleges, where necessary, should present no great problems.

9. THE AVOIDANCE OF CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST

Prof. Leland Medsker, Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of California, Berkeley, has identified an important criterion for community college governance:

The controlling agency of a community college should be one which can have no conflict of interest between the community college and any other institution for which it is responsible. Its dedication to the unique characteristics of the community college must be unquestioned.

This freedom from conflicts-of-interest is particularly important as to the allocation of public resources for education. There is a considerable danger that, although a board with dual responsibilities may request support for its community colleges, its greatest efforts will be on behalf of the K-12 public schools which are its primary concern. Dr. Richard Browne, of the Illinois Junior College Board, reports that public funds provided for that State's community colleges increased significantly when a separate board was provided to assert their interests. The same experience can be seen in a number of other states which have recently established boards whose sole responsibility is for community colleges.

10. THE COST OF SEPARATE BOARDS

The cost of establishing separate boards for community colleges would not be any greater than the costs of the development under the present arrangements. And, indeed, the establishment of separate boards for governance and coordination should result in financial savings, through the increased efficiency to be gained through more effective planning and development.

11. THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Under Maryland law, the State Board of Education has the responsibility for the State approval of institutions of education. The establishment of a separate State board for community colleges would in no way affect the approval powers or functions of the State Board of Education.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION FOR A SEPARATE STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

It is recommended that a State Board for Community Colleges be established, separate from the State Board of Education, whose sole responsibility shall be for Maryland's community colleges, according to the following guidelines:

1. *The State Board for Community Colleges should consist of seven members: six citizens of the State appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve six-year overlapping terms, and the State Superintendent of Schools who should serve ex-officio with full power to vote on any matter before the Board. Among the initial appointees, the Governor there should be included one member of the State Board of Education.*
2. *The State Board for Community Colleges should serve as an advisory board to the State Board of Education with regard to community college matters until July 1, 1968, at which time the State Board for Community Colleges would assume full State-wide responsibilities for the community colleges.*

3. *The State Board for Community Colleges should, from its establishment, be authorized to employ a full-time salaried director and such additional staff as may be necessary to carry out its duties.*
4. *The State Board for Community Colleges should have the following powers, duties, and functions:*
 - a. *To establish general policies for the operation of the State's community colleges;*
 - b. *To conduct studies on the problems of community college education;*
 - c. *To assist the community colleges individually and collectively by providing expert professional advice in all areas of their activities;*
 - d. *To review and advise upon all curriculum proposals for newly established community colleges and for proposed major additions to or modifications of programs in existing community colleges;*
 - e. *To recommend, review, and advise upon proposals for the establishment of new community colleges;*
 - f. *To coordinate relationships among the community colleges to assure the widest possible educational opportunities for the students of the State and the most efficient use of funds;*
 - g. *To facilitate the transfer of students between the community colleges and the University of Maryland, the State Colleges, and other institutions of higher education;*
 - h. *To coordinate relationships between the community colleges and the State and local public school systems and private high schools in order to facilitate cooperation with them in guidance and admission of students to the community colleges*

and to arrange for the most advantageous use of facilities;

- i. *To establish and maintain a system of information and accounting of community college operations;*
- j. *To provide grants-in-aid for the prompt and adequate planning of new colleges and new programs in existing colleges;*
- k. *To administer the State's program of support for the community colleges;*
- l. *To assist and represent the community colleges in seeking and administering monies available to them from Federal and other sources;*
- m. *To assist the Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education in its investigation of needs throughout the State and in its preparation of plans and recommendations for the establishment and location of new facilities and programs relating to the community colleges;*
- n. *To report annually to the General Assembly on the Board's activities and the activities of the community colleges.*

RECOMMENDATION FOR OPTIONAL SEPARATE LOCAL BOARDS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

It is recommended that, at the option of each local board of education, a local Board of Trustees be established for the community college or colleges of each county and Baltimore City, separate from the local board of education, according to the following guidelines:

- 1. *Any local board of education or the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City wishing to be divested of its responsibility for community college governance should be authorized to request at any time by appropriate resolution that the Governor*

appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a separate community college Board of Trustees for its local unit.

2. *The separate Boards of Trustees should consist of either five or seven members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the residents of the area served by the college, to serve six-year overlapping terms. Among the initial appointees, there should be included one member of the local board of education. The president of the community college, or one of them in the case where the Board has responsibility for more than one college, should serve as secretary-treasurer to the Board of Trustees.*
3. *The powers, duties and functions of the separate Board of Trustees should be those previously exercised by the local board of education constituted as a board of community college trustees.*
4. *Upon request by appropriate resolution of a regional board of community college trustees, the Governor should appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a new Board of Trustees for such regional community college, to assume the powers, duties and functions of the previous Board.*
5. *The new regional Board of Trustees should consist of seven members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the residents of the several units served by the college. Among the initial appointees, there should be included one member from the local board of education of each unit served by the college. Provided, however, that a majority of the Board should not also be members of the local boards of education, and if it be necessary to effect this result and achieve an odd number of board members, the size of the regional board may be increased.*

6. *If more than one community college is located within a single county or Baltimore City, exclusive of regional community colleges, they should be governed by a single Board of Trustees.*

CHAPTER VIII

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE STUDY: SCHOLARSHIPS AND LOANS

INTRODUCTION

By House Joint Resolution No. 61 of the 1966 General Assembly, the Advisory Council was requested to conduct a study of the State's programs of student financial assistance, and to "make recommendations for providing a rational and coordinated financial aid program... to assure that no Maryland student will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of costs alone."

THE QUESTIONS CONSIDERED

In undertaking this study, the Advisory Council took the position that student financial assistance is a legitimate and important part of Maryland's responsibility for higher education. This premise is a point of long-standing agreement among those concerned with our democratic system of higher education. As a sound investment in the future of the State and its people, student financial aid makes sense. The questions to be answered in the Council's study, then, are as follows:

1. What are the basic principles upon which a sound system of student financial aid should be based?
2. In terms of these principles, how effective are the State's present programs of student financial aid?
3. How effective are these present programs in terms of dollar-efficiency?
4. Are there areas of need not met by the State's present student financial aid programs?
5. What changes might be made in these present programs to serve more effectively the needs of the State and its people?
6. What new programs of student financial aid might be created to meet needs not being met at present?
7. What should be the size of the State's investment in the area of student financial need?

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

In seeking the answers to these questions, the Advisory Council undertook a number of studies and sought information from a number of sources.

1. A detailed study was made, with the cooperation of the State Scholarship Board and the Higher Education Loan Corporation, of the programs administered by those agencies.
2. Information was sought from a number of other states on their own programs of student financial assistance and their experiences with them.
3. Officials of the U. S. Office of Education and United Student Aid Funds, Inc. were contacted, to gain an understanding of student financial aid from a national perspective.
4. Relevant literature on the subject of student financial assistance was reviewed.
5. Data from the Advisory Council's Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors were analyzed for their implications for student financial aid.
6. The preliminary findings from these investigations were circulated among a large number of persons concerned with Maryland's programs of student financial aid, and the reactions of these persons were solicited.
7. The Council's Policy Committee on Support of Higher Education held an open meeting, to which the financial aid officers of public and private colleges, the members and staffs of the State Scholarship Board and the Higher Education Loan Corporation, representatives of various education groups, and others, were invited to speak on the problems of student financial aid.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In analyzing the information gathered on student financial assistance and in formulating its recommendations, the Advisory Council benefited from the efforts and points-of-view of a number of groups and individuals.

1. The Council's Policy Committee on Support of Higher Education gave careful attention to the information received by the Council and formulated a series of proposals for the Council's consideration.

2. The staff of the Advisory Council assisted the Council and the Support Committee in its study, and also presented a series of proposals for the Council's consideration.
3. The proposals presented to the Council were circulated among the agencies presently administering financial aid programs; the presidents and/or financial aid officers of both public and private institutions of higher education; and groups interested in education, such as the Maryland State Teachers' Association, the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers, and others. The points-of-view of these groups and individuals on the proposals were considered by the Council in the formulation of its recommendations.

The recommendations of the Advisory Council on the subject of student financial aid--which are presented in full in a later section of this Chapter--have been developed largely on the basis of the proposals of the Council's Policy Committee on Support of Higher Education.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

The following principles should be recognized as basic to any sound system of student financial assistance:

1. Student financial assistance should not be viewed merely as a cost to the State; rather, it is an investment in the future welfare of the State and its people.
2. No student should be denied the opportunity for post-secondary education because of costs alone. The over-all size of a financial assistance program should be determined by the over-all size of the needs to be met.
3. Financial assistance should be provided to individual students according to their actual needs. It is irrelevant whether these needs arise from tuition costs, from costs for room and board, or from some other necessary educational expense. Any legitimate educational expense which cannot be met by the student from his own or other resources is a legitimate object of student financial assistance.
4. Where unlimited funds are not available for student financial assistance, first consideration should be given to those needy students who gave evidence of having the greatest potential for successfully continuing their education.

5. Any student should be expected to meet a part of the costs of his education from his own resources, and in many cases by borrowing.
6. There is no single best form of student financial assistance. A student's needs can be met through scholarships, loans, and part-time employment, in addition to support from other sources, a sound financial aid program should offer an appropriate combination of these elements.
7. The structure of a sound student financial aid program should be such that assistance is provided where it is needed. The only limitations which should be placed upon the provision of assistance are such limitations as are necessary to promote an efficient and effective distribution of that assistance.
8. The administrative structure of a sound student financial aid program should reflect the basic goals of the program. In particular, assistance should be administered by authorities in a position to evaluate the relevant factors of need and academic potential. In addition, the administrative structure should reflect the fact that the various different forms of student financial assistance serve the same end, i.e., the broadening of educational opportunities.
9. The purposes of a student financial assistance program should not be confused with other goals, such as the recruitment of needed personnel. Such other goals should be pursued through these programs only insofar as the primary purposes of the programs are not compromised.
10. Post-secondary education encompasses more than undergraduate academic degree programs; financial assistance should be provided for students in other areas as well.
11. In planning a student financial assistance program, the existence of Federal programs in this area, and the interest shown by private sources of support, should be taken into account.

PRESENT PROGRAMS

The State of Maryland currently provides financial assistance to its college students through a variety of programs, the most significant of which are administered through the State Scholarship Board and the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation. The State also provides

some student financial assistance through its individual institutions and assistance for special groups, such as medical students at the University of Maryland and War Orphans; also, Maryland students are eligible for assistance from sources other than the State. These latter programs, however, are outside the scope of the present study and recommendations. The financial structure of the programs studied appears as Table 14.

SCHOLARSHIPS

The State Scholarship Board administers three distinct programs of scholarships for Maryland undergraduates attending college within the State: the General State Tuition Scholarship Program, the Teacher Education Scholarship Program, and the Legislative or Senatorial Scholarship Program. These programs--which will cost the State some two million dollars, exclusive of administration, for Fiscal 1967--theoretically provide awards on the basis of each applicant's financial need and ability.

The General State Tuition (GST) Scholarship Program provides for a number of awards with an annual value of \$500, to be used for tuition costs only, in any undergraduate degree program in the State. The Number of awards in force--determined by the number of members in the General Assembly--has been limited to 684, or 171 each year, although the yearly number may vary due to drop-outs. Besides the regular GST awards, which are renewable for four years, an indefinite number of "special" one-year awards are made, to utilize funds building up when students enroll at institutions where tuition charges are below \$500. The GST's are apportioned among the State's counties and the legislative districts of Baltimore City, according to their representation in the General Assembly. The awards are made in each county or district strictly according to the applicants' rankings on a competitive examination conducted once each year by the Board, but only to applicants found by the Board, on the basis of a parent's financial statement, to have definite need.

The Teacher Education (TE) Scholarship Program is similar in many respects to the General State Tuition Scholarship Program, having the same number of awards, of the same amount, similarly apportioned according to residency, and awarded on the same measures of ability and need. They are, however, available only for use in the State's private institutions, and only for study in Teacher Education. Additionally, each recipient must agree to teach for two years in the public schools of the State after graduation.

The Senatorial Scholarship Program is by far the largest of the State financial assistance programs, involving 1.2 million dollars--that is, two-thirds of the two million dollars administered through the State Scholarship Board. It is also structured quite differently from the GST

and TE Scholarship Programs. Appointments are made for the most part by State Senators. The State Scholarship Board's responsibilities extend only to fiscal administration of the Program. While all Senatorial recipients are required to pass the Board's competitive examination, the awards may be made without further regard to ranking on the examination. Similarly, the law provides that the appointing authorities "shall take into consideration the financial need of the several applicants," but does not require that the awards be made according to need. The Senatorial Scholarships are awarded according to residency, but most awards have been apportioned equally among the counties and legislative districts, regardless of their population. Each Senatorial award is limited to use at a particular institution--four public and twelve private institutions, including one private secondary school. All Senatorial Scholarships are either Full Scholarships, covering tuition, room and board, or Partial Scholarships, covering just tuition; except that appointing authorities are free to split a scholarship between two or more recipients. Any recipient of a Full Senatorial Scholarship must enroll in a Teacher Education curriculum, and agree to teach in the public schools of the State for two years following graduation.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

The Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation (MHELC) is the State Agency for guaranteed student loans. As such, the Corporation arranges for students to borrow funds for higher education from private lending institutions, such as banks, at low-interest and with long-term repayment. These favorable terms are possible because the Corporation guarantees all loans against default, while the Federal government pays a portion of the interest charges. A private corporation, United Student Aid Funds acts as the endorser and holding company of the guarantee reserve funds, through a contract with MHELC. The MHELC operates with an 8 percent guarantee reserve fund, so that its 1967 appropriation of \$150,000 serves to guarantee a total of \$1,875,000 in student loans. Although MHELC has been in operation less than a year and a half, it has to date arranged more than three thousand one-year student loans, averaging about \$800. For the first six months of the present fiscal year, an average of 360 loans a month, for an average amount of \$867 have been arranged. Students may borrow up to \$1000 per year, or \$1500 for graduate study, to a maximum of \$7500, from any participating lender in the State. The amount actually borrowed is determined by the student, his college, and the lender, in terms of the student's financial needs. The loans may be used at any accredited institution in or outside Maryland. The loans, which bear six percent simple interest, are repaid by the students after graduation, over as long a period as ten years. For more than ninety percent of the borrowers--those whose families' annual adjusted incomes are less than \$15,000--the Federal government pays all interest while the student is in college, and half of the interest during the repayment period.

STATE PROGRAMS OF GENERAL STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE: FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Program	1967 Appropriation	Approximate Number Recipients, 1966-67	Maximum Amount Per Year, Each Student
General State Tuition Scholarship Program	\$342, 000	980	\$500
Teacher Education Scholarship Program	342, 000	460	500
Senatorial Scholarship Program: Private Institutions	1, 125, 503 ¹	660	Tuition, room & board
Senatorial Scholarship Program: Public Institutions	117, 510 ²	315	Tuition, room 7 board
Sub-total: Scholarships	\$1, 927, 013	2, 415	
Guaranteed Student Loan Program	\$150, 000	2, 163 (6 mos.)	\$1, 000 Undergraduates \$1, 500 Graduate Students
Total	\$2, 077, 013	4, 578 ³	

Notes: 1. The amount actually appropriated is less than the total obligations of the State under this program, because scholarships to five private colleges have been added recently and are currently being phased into the program. Total obligations are \$1,313,500, by 1966-67 catalogue charges. Excludes a secondary school, for which \$44,225 was appropriated.

2. Figure given is for estimated obligations based on 1966-67 catalogue charges, since no separate appropriation data appears in the budgets for these institutions.

3. Number of scholarships and loans, whether held by same of different individuals.

Source: Advisory Council Staff Study, based on data obtained from the State Scholarship Board, Higher Education Loan Corporation, State budget documents, and catalogues of institutions.

PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

As one might expect with a series of programs that have grown somewhat haphazardly over the years, the State's financial assistance programs are beset with a number of problems. Some are minor, and result mostly in unnecessary annoyance; but others are major problems, seriously limiting the effectiveness of these programs in serving the needs of Maryland's students.

1. THE PRESENT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS LACK FLEXIBILITY

This is the single most serious problem with present student financial aid programs, taken either singly or as a group. Because of the many terms and conditions attached to most scholarships, the present programs are liable to failure precisely in their fundamental goal, i.e., providing assistance where it is most needed.

--All three major scholarship programs make awards according to the student's county or legislative district of residence. When the awards allocated to a given unit are used, no more assistance is available to that unit's residents except by extraordinary arrangements, even though funds may be awarded elsewhere to less needy and less deserving persons.

--The Senatorial Scholarship Program - which is by far the largest of the three programs, and the only program offering awards greater than \$500 per year - limits to a specific institution the use of any given scholarship. Some of these awards are in great demand, while others are noticeably less so; consequently many deserving applicants are disappointed, while other awards are made to less deserving students, or are not made at all.

--All Full Senatorial Scholarships and all Teacher Education (TE) Scholarships are limited to those who wish, or are willing, to become teachers. Because of these restrictions, many of these awards cannot be made at all, and money is needlessly reverted to the Treasury, while needy and deserving students with other laudable career goals are unable to find assistance.

--The General State Tuition (GST) Scholarships are available only to students who have never entered college, unnecessarily denying opportunities to students whose needs develop during their college career.

2. THE AMOUNT OF MOST SCHOLARSHIPS TOO RIGIDLY FIXED AND TOO SMALL

Related to the principle that assistance should be provided where it is needed, is the principle that the amount of assistance provided to individuals should be based on individual need. This principle is largely ineffective in Maryland's present scholarship programs. In two of the programs, awards are valued at a flat \$500 per year, and applicable only to tuition in the GST Program; while the "splitting" of awards is permissible in the Senatorial Scholarship Program, these scholarships are otherwise each set at a pre-determined amount. By contrast, the actual needs of individual students vary from a few hundred dollars to as much as a few thousand dollars. There is no adequate provision under the present programs to provide that the scholarships granted are proportionate to the needs of the recipients. Consequently, it is entirely possible for one student to receive considerably less assistance than he actually needs, while another may receive an amount considerably in excess of his actual needs. In the first case, the recipient may still be unable to afford higher education; in the second case, the State's funds are unnecessarily wasted.

Another problem relates to the maximum size of the awards. Only in the Senatorial Scholarship Program do the scholarships available exceed \$500 in annual value. Measured against today's charges for higher education, this is an unrealistic limit at which to set financial assistance. In particular, the Teacher Education Scholarships, which may be used only in private institutions, are far from adequate to meet even the basic charges at these institutions.

3. THE PRESENT PROGRAMS ARE NOT LARGE ENOUGH TO MEET EXISTING NEEDS

An analysis of data obtained from the Advisory Council's Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors shows that, in the past two years, an average of 3,989 seniors each year with high school grade-averages of 'C' or better reported that they were not planning to continue their education beyond high school, but would continue if given "a scholarship or a low interest long-term loan." The expansion of the State's student financial assistance programs to provide for these students should not be beyond the State's capacity.

Another group to consider is the number of students presently enrolled in higher education only through unreasonable hardships and sacrifices. Such students would qualify for assistance under an expanded program, but the amount necessary to provide for them cannot be accurately assessed.

As to the State's guaranteed student loan program, estimates from a number of sources suggest that the guaranteed loan capacity of the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation is well below the level of estimated demand for Maryland students. For fiscal year 1967, the Loan Corporation received \$150,000 from the State for loan guarantee reserve; this is sufficient to guarantee loans totaling \$1,875,000. As estimated by the U. S. Office of Education, however, Maryland's potential loan demand under this program is \$11,787,000. The demand estimate of the American Bankers Association is \$10,400,000 for Maryland student borrowers.

4. PRESENT PROGRAMS HAVE NO PROVISION FOR EXPANSION TO MEET GROWING NEEDS

Although the number of potential students requiring financial assistance grows continually as the college-age population swells - and indeed grows faster than that population - none of Maryland's student financial assistance programs is structured to expand with this growth. The value of the Senatorial Scholarships increase automatically as college charges increase, but the number of awards remains constant despite growing needs. In the General State Tuition and Teacher Education Scholarship Programs, both the number of awards and their value remain constant from year to year. This arrangement clearly violates the principle that provisions to meet need should be proportionate to that need, and creates the risk that the student financial aid programs are becoming increasingly ineffective.

5. PRESENT PROGRAMS FAIL TO PROVIDE FOR OTHER KINDS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

The State's three major scholarship programs provide assistance only to students in undergraduate academic degree programs. The Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation administers loans only for academic study. No State program of any kind provides student financial assistance for the wide range of occupational, technical, and vocational areas of education that are offered in non-academic non-degree institutions. And yet, there is a manifest need for assistance in these areas, which are of recognized importance to a comprehensive system of post-secondary education.

The data obtained from the Advisory Council's Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors reveal something of the extent of the need for non-academic educational assistance. Of the average of 3,989 seniors in each of 1965 and 1966 who indicated that they did not plan to continue their education but would continue if provided with a scholarship or loan, almost two-thirds indicated that they were interested in non-academic education. An average of 2,555 seniors each year indicated that they would have used such financial assistance to enroll in business, nursing, or trade and technical schools.

The Federal government has indicated its interest in this field by the establishment of a vocational student loan program, on a basis similar to its academic guaranteed student loan program. Under this program, the Federal government will assist vocational students by paying a portion of the interest on guaranteed loans, arranged with private lenders, as it does for loans for academic study. At the present time, however, the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation is not legally structured to participate in this program, and the State provides none of the funds necessary to guarantee the loans. Consequently, a significant group of potential students is denied the opportunity to pursue post-secondary education appropriate to their career-goals.

6. TOO LITTLE COORDINATION EXISTS BETWEEN THE SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN AUTHORITIES

Maryland's scholarship and loan programs exist to serve the same ends, albeit by different means. The close relationship between the two types of assistance is particularly evident from the point of view of those whom the programs serve, i. e., the students. A student who hopes to win a scholarship should also be interested in the possibility of borrowing for his education, either in the event he does not receive an award or to supplement a scholarship.

Nevertheless, there is only very limited coordination between the State's scholarship and loan authorities. In their relations with students and the public, their administrative procedures, and their substantive assistance, there is room for much greater coordination between them. Students would be well encouraged to view financial assistance in terms of a "package," involving some combination of a scholarship, a loan, part-time employment, and so on. Consequently, it would be desirable for the State to structure its student financial assistance agencies so as to facilitate this sort of arrangement.

7. SENATORIAL SCHOLARSHIPS ARE A PRODUCT OF HISTORY, NOT PLANNING

The growth of the Senatorial Scholarship Program over the years has not been the result of careful consideration or rational planning. These scholarships have grown and multiplied with little consideration for the fundamental question of what are the most appropriate arrangements for the awarding of scholarships.

The fact that most scholarships are awarded by State Legislators has long-been a source of criticism. On the one hand, it seems clear that the majority of these scholarships are awarded conscientiously and not out of political considerations. On the other hand, this may not be enough: there should not even be grounds for suspicion in a State scholarship program. (Questions of legality are not central to this

problem, since the laws are worded so permissively that no appointing authority is under any legal obligation to make awards to the neediest or the most able applicant.)

The real problem, however, is not one of political motives. Rather it is that State Legislators, however scrupulous and conscientious, are not in a position to assure the most effective and equitable administration of these scholarships. When this program was first established, it was no doubt too small to warrant the establishment of an independent authority to administer it. And, it was not then unreasonable to expect that State Legislators were in a position to know something about the financial condition and academic potential of their constituents, many of whom they could know personally. Today, however, conditions have very much changed. The Program has grown to a cost of well over a million dollars annually. An independent agency now exists to administer other scholarship programs. And, above all, the responsibilities of State Legislators, and the size of their constituencies, has grown to a point where the time and information necessary for the effective and equitable award of scholarships is simply not available to them.

A few years ago, the scholarship laws were amended to provide State Legislators with assistance from the State Scholarship Board in the form of evaluations of student's needs. Only a very few legislators have availed themselves of this service. Consequently, most Senatorial Scholarships are awarded without the benefit of this necessary information. There seems little reason why the administrative effectiveness that the State has provided for its other scholarship programs, through an independent State agency, should not for the future be provided for all scholarships.

8. PROVISIONS FOR RECRUITING TEACHERS LIMIT THE EFFECTIVENESS AND CONFUSE THE PURPOSES OF MANY SCHOLARSHIPS

As noted above, all full Senatorial Scholarships and all Teacher Education Scholarships are available only to students planning to enter teaching. To enforce this limitation, each recipient must take appropriate courses in education, and must agree to teach in the public schools of the State for two years after graduation. This agreement takes the form of a performance bond; in cases of default, all scholarship monies received are to be returned to the State. This involves a number of problems.

In the first place, there are real doubts as to the enforcement of this agreement. In the past, no State machinery has existed to provide for enforcement. Consequently, while some defaulting recipients have repaid the State, many others haven't. Indeed, until recently, no means existed even to determine cases of default, let alone recover funds.

Present arrangements for enforcement of the teaching obligations have not been in effect for a long enough time to evaluate their effectiveness.

But even if the enforcement of agreements to teach is feasible, many doubt that it would be worth the cost and effort. They would prefer instead to assume that the better part of those who graduate from an education curriculum will in fact be interested in teaching, and to let defaults occur, rather than to coerce the defaulters into teaching against their will.

In addition, criticisms have been raised against the use of student financial assistance programs to recruit teachers. Certainly, this does not get effectively to the basic problem, which is low salaries in the teaching profession. It is probable that many who enter teaching because of a scholarship obligation to do so do not remain in the profession beyond the minimum period of their obligation. Furthermore, there are a number of areas other than teaching in which trained personnel are in short supply.

Finally, even if student aid programs are appropriate means for teacher recruitment, there is real doubt that this goal is properly embodied in the State's present scholarship programs. Most important, each scholarship aimed at teacher recruitment is one less scholarship available for general student aid purposes. As noted above, these teacher recruitment scholarships frequently are awarded to less qualified students, or are not awarded at all, while the remaining funds are insufficient to serve other needy and deserving applicants. Under present arrangements, then, the central purposes of student financial assistance are obstructed to a significant degree by the secondary purpose of teacher recruitment.

9. A SINGLE COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION IS NOT AN ADEQUATE MEASURE OF ACADEMIC POTENTIAL

Along with need, the key determinant in the award of a scholarship should be the student's potential for academic success. Under present programs, this is measured by a competitive examination, of the electronically-graded multiple-choice variety. Educators would agree that this is likely to be an inadequate and, therefore, unfair, measure of the abilities of a great many students. Many highly able students simply do not "test" well on this sort of examination. In addition, present procedures call for the administration of this examination on only one day during the year. If a student is ill, or otherwise prevented from making a fair showing of his ability, he has no recourse.

A far more accurate predictor of academic achievement would be a combination of this sort of "objective" examination with some measure of each student's performance in high school. But even if a single-factor evaluation were necessary, there is no reason why this must be a special once-a-year examination: college-bound students are already subjected to a number of similar examinations their scores on which might be

used, rather than requiring the students to take, and the State to pay for, yet another such examination.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Advisory Council believes the recommendations contained in this Chapter to be fundamental to the establishment of "a rational and coordinated financial aid program" for Maryland, as requested by the 1966 General Assembly. The Council's recommendations are based in large measure upon the proposals of its Policy Committee on Support of Higher Education, and take into account the points-of-view expressed by a variety of groups and individuals interested in financial aid for Maryland's students.

The Advisory Council is making its recommendations on the premise that the "package" approach to student financial assistance is the most appropriate and desirable one for realistically meeting the real needs of students. The "package" approach means that:

- a. the real financial needs of individual students should take into account the costs of tuition, fees, room, board, and/or such other legitimate educational expenses as their individual situations require;
- b. the financial needs of individual students should be met by a combination of a number of different resources, including scholarships, loans, part-time employment, parental contributions, etc., rather than from any single source.

To meet the various and growing needs of individual students, and to provide for the most efficient use of the State's financial assistance expenditures, the Council's recommendations include the establishment of a new, unified program of general scholarships; the establishment of "forgiveness" provisions in the student loan program, providing certain scholarship features; the creation of a new program of guaranteed student loans for post-secondary vocational education; and the merger of the present State scholarship and loan agencies into a single board for student financial assistance.

It is recommended that, in order to provide for coordination of the State's various programs of student financial assistance and the implementation of the "package" approach to student aid, a new Maryland Student Financial Assistance Board be established, to administer the State's programs of scholarships and student loans, by a merger of the present State Scholarship Board and the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation. The members of the new Board should be appointed by the Governor

with the advice and consent of the Senate, taking advantage where possible of the knowledge and experience possessed by the members of the present scholarship and loan boards. Under this new Board, there should be separate directors for the administration of the scholarship and the loan programs.

It is recommended that a new, unified Program of general State scholarships be established, replacing the present General State Tuition Scholarship Program, Teacher Education Scholarship Program, and Legislative (Senatorial) Scholarship Program.

- a. *The Program should be entirely administered, and the scholarships awarded by, the new Student Financial Assistance Board.*
- b. *The scholarships awarded under this Program should be available to high school graduates who are Maryland residents, for enrollment in undergraduate degree programs in public or private Maryland institutions of higher education.*

On this point, some members of the Council preferred the proposal of the Council's Committee on Support, that a portion, perhaps half, of the scholarship funds be reserved for students enrolled in the specific private institutions of higher education currently participating in the Senatorial Scholarship Program.

- c. *The scholarships should be awarded without regard to the particular county or legislative district in which the recipients reside.*
- d. *The scholarships should be awarded on the basis of both the financial need and academic potential of the respective applicants.*
- e. *The scholarships should vary in size from \$200 to \$1,200 per year, according to a formula based on the financial need of the individual recipients, as determined by the Student Financial Assistance Board, for such legitimate educational expenses as tuition, fees, room and/or board.*

- f. In evaluating the academic potential of the respective applicants, the Student Financial Assistance Board should take into account such measures as each student's performance on one or more competitive examinations, scholastic record in high school, and such other criteria as the agency shall determine.
- g. To provide for the automatic growth of this Program as needs grow, the over-all size of the new Program should be determined each year according to the number of students graduating from high schools in the State. The initial size of the new scholarship Program should be approximately equal to the combined size of the present General State Tuition, Teacher Education, and Senatorial Scholarship Programs. For example, the amount to be appropriated each fiscal year might be equal to \$1,000 multiplied by five percent of the number of students that graduated from Maryland high schools in the fiscal year two years preceding, as reported by the State Department of Education.
- h. Once awarded, a scholarship should be automatically renewable for a total of four years or until the recipient graduates from a four-year program, whichever shall be sooner, provided that the recipient continues in good academic standing as determined by the institution.
- i. Any student awarded a scholarship under the present General State Tuition, Teacher Education, or Senatorial Scholarship Programs should be entitled to receive the full value of that scholarship, according to the original terms of the award, from the funds appropriated for the new scholarship Program.

It is recommended that the State's guaranteed student loan program be expanded and broadened by the following provisions:

- a. In order to encourage a larger number of students to complete college, the State's guaranteed student loan program should be supplemented by the provision

of loan-forgiveness amounting to ten percent of the amount borrowed, for each student who graduates from an undergraduate degree program. The amount forgiven under this provision should be paid to the lender upon the student's graduation by the Student Financial Assistance Board.

- b. In order to encourage students to enter the field of teaching, provision should be established, within the framework of the State's program of guaranteed student loans, for the forgiveness of loans for students entering teaching after graduation. Specifically, twenty percent of the amount borrowed should be forgiven for each year that the borrower teaches in the public schools of the State, up to the complete forgiveness of the loan then outstanding. The amount forgiven should be paid to the lender by the Student Financial Assistance Board.*
- c. The provision of loan-forgiveness should be utilized in the future to encourage students to enter such other important fields of endeavor as the legislature shall determine to be in critical need of personnel.*

It is recommended that, in order to provide financial assistance for students in non-academic fields of study, a new Program of guaranteed student loans be established for students enrolled in post-secondary vocational curricula, in conformity to the provisions of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1965. This Program to be administered by the Student Financial Assistance Board.

A possible financial structure for these student financial assistance programs is presented as Table 15 of this Report.

The Advisory Council wishes to note certain proposals of its Committee on Support on which no action has been taken; namely, that a portion of the new Scholarship Program be distributed according to the residence of the recipients and that the Teacher Education Scholarships be retained pending further study.

The Council and its Support Committee feel that the geographic allotment of Scholarships according to political subdivisions has been inequitable. The Support Committee recommended that scholarships be

awarded partly according to the number of high school graduates in each unit and partly without regard to residency. The Council believes that it should be the responsibility of the State Agency awarding scholarships to devise a plan of administration that prevents inequities.

With regard to the question of Teacher Education Scholarships to private colleges, the Council felt that its proposal of enlarged general scholarships provided opportunities to prospective teachers as well as to others without placing special responsibilities of repayment on one group of scholarship recipients based on service to the State through teaching. Further, the Council feels that its proposal of a Loan Program with Forgiveness Features offers a special incentive for prospective teachers by providing for cancellation of a portion or all of the repayment of the loan through actual teaching. This plan places the responsibility on the recipients to obtain cancellation of their loan repayment as compared with the present system which places the responsibility on the State to collect from those who promise to teach but do not do so.

Finally, the Council notes that while it did devote attention to the State's policy of Tuition Waiver for Education students at certain public institutions who pledge to teach in the State's public schools after graduation, the Council decided to make no broad recommendations on this subject at this time. However, the Council felt that as long as this policy is continued, it ought to be applied equitably to all the State's public institutions offering programs which lead to teacher certification.

It is recommended that the State's policy of Tuition Waiver for Education students be applicable to students at St. Mary's College of Maryland, on the same basis as it applies elsewhere, when St. Mary's College develops a four-year program in Education.

It is recommended that the State's policy of Tuition Waiver for Education students be applicable, on the same basis as it applies elsewhere, to students enrolled in transfer programs in the State's public community colleges leading to teacher certification.

TABLE 16.

**Possible Financial Structure of
Recommended State Financial Assistance Programs**

Program	Appropriation	Approx. No. Recipients	Avg. Assistance Per Recipient	Max. Assistance Per Recipient
General Scholarship Program	\$2,350,000 ¹	2,600	\$900	\$1,200
Guaranteed Student Loan Program: Reserve Fund	500,000 ²	7,800 ³	600	1,000 Undergraduate 1,200 Graduate
Guaranteed Student Loan Program: Graduation Forgiveness	376,000 ⁴	4,700 ⁵	80 ⁶	10% of loan
Guaranteed Student Loan Program: Teaching Forgiveness	900,000 ⁴	1,400 ⁶	65 ⁷	The remaining 90%
Vocational Loan Program: Reserve Funds	200,000 ²	5,000	500	1,000
Total	\$1,376,000⁸	13,400⁹	\$720¹⁰	

Notes:

1. Based on formula of \$1000 multiplied by 5% of high school graduates 1965-66.
2. Revolving guarantee reserve funds; future appropriations could be reduced as loans repaid.
3. Based on estimates of Higher Education Loan Corporation, as 10% of those eligible to borrow.
4. Funds obligated, but not to be appropriated until loan repayments fall due.
5. Based on estimated graduation rate of 60% of borrowers.
6. Based on estimate that 30% of graduated borrowers will enter teaching.
7. Based on estimate that 1/3 of borrowers entering teaching, 70% will teach 3 or more years,
1/3 will teach 4 years, 6% will teach 2 years, and 14% will teach one year.
8. Including funds obligated for future payment, but not requiring immediate appropriation.
9. Number of scholarships and loans, whether held by same or different individuals.
10. Based on total assistance of \$1,100,000, and treating scholarships and loans as separate transactions, although they might in fact be combined by individuals.

SOURCE: Advisory Council Staff Study.

CHAPTER IX

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY STUDY

THE URGENCY OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION SALARY QUESTION

Maryland is confronted with a critical situation in its competition with other states for high quality faculty and administrators for its public colleges and university. Although the State has made commendable efforts in recent years to increase its faculty and administrative salary schedules, other states have not been inactive. Not only is Maryland falling behind in its support of a salary schedule in its public colleges and university commensurate with its financial ability, but the salaries it is providing are presently less than the average salaries for comparable positions throughout the United States.

For Maryland's people, therefore, a critical decision is at hand. The time is ripe for a significant breakthrough — the creation of a higher educational system committed to excellence. A courageous acceptance, or a rejection, of this commitment to excellence in higher education, with all its implications, is what is here called for. The Advisory Council believes that halfway measures will fall hopelessly short of the goal of high quality essential for a higher educational system required by Maryland's exceptional wealth and rate of economic growth.

Ideally, Maryland's higher educational institutions should be at a high level of quality now. To reach such a degree of excellence, the Advisory Council recommends that faculty and administrative salaries, as a means to attain and sustain this level of quality, should be at or above the seventy-fifth percentile of salaries for the nation as a whole. Using the seventy-fifth percentile as a salary level goal, one fourth of comparable institutions in the nation would still have average salaries higher than those proposed by the Advisory Council.

The Council is cognizant of the fact that the size of the task is such that the State of Maryland may not be able to reach the full goal of truly competitive salaries immediately, but the State should be able to achieve this objective within the next four years. It is highly important, in any case, that the State adopt a salary policy for its institutions of higher learning which will assist college and university administrators in recruiting and retaining the kinds of academic personnel which will best serve the needs of Maryland's citizens. Such a commitment will mean average salary increases of more than \$1,000 per year for the next several years. The alternative is clear: as other states continue to make breakthroughs in their level of support for higher education, Maryland

will be more and more at a disadvantage in staffing its colleges and university with qualified faculties and administrators.

At the very outset, stress must be laid on the fact that Maryland must staff its educational institutions within the framework of a keenly competitive national market for qualified academic personnel. Reputable associations, representative of the academic profession, annually publish salary data on a comparative basis. Comparison with these national norms is a legitimate basis for analysis and planning for the development of Maryland's educational institutions. Such comparisons, made with due cognizance of the uniqueness of Maryland, are rendered necessary in the area of salaries particularly by reason of the pressures within the profession itself, the awareness of the faculty of these norms, and the consequent restiveness and mobility of present-day collegiate personnel.

PURPOSE, NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The Laws of Maryland place upon the Advisory Council for Higher Education the responsibility to give careful and objective consideration to all areas affecting higher education in the State. Although the Council is well aware that many facets of the college and university system require attention and intensive study, a priority was given, during the past year, to the issue of salaries because of the State's concern for the development of quality in the education provided by it's public institutions of higher learning.

Excellence in a college or university is the product of many factors. The Council believes, however, that the most important single factor determining the excellence of an educational institution is the quality of its faculty. The Council also believes that the level of salaries largely determines the calibre of personnel an institution is capable of attracting and retaining. Administrative and faculty salaries — the most direct solution to the problem of attracting and holding competent personnel — are, therefore, prime areas for the Council's study and recommendations.

Insofar as it was possible, the study included all of the institutions within the tri-partite system of public higher education in the State. Included in the study were the University of Maryland, the five State Colleges under the Board of Trustees, Morgan State College, Maryland State College, and the two-year colleges. The study investigated faculty and administrative salaries, their present level, and their comparative status with national norms for comparable classifications of institutions. On the basis of this status analysis, the Council developed recommendations leading to the attainment of a degree of excellence in Maryland's higher educational institutions consistent with the State's financial ability, its educational and economic needs, and its status within the nation.

Perquisites, or fringe benefits, although an essential part of faculty and administrative remuneration, because of their distinct importance and complexity, have not been included in the present analysis. The Council intends to undertake the investigation of the subject of fringe benefits as a separate study.

In brief, then, the purpose of this study was to provide the simple facts that the Executive and Legislative branches of our government must take into account in considering the faculty and administrative salary aspects of Maryland's support of public higher education.

SOURCES AND KINDS OF DATA

Data essential for understanding the position of Maryland's higher educational institutions relative to similar institutions throughout the nation were drawn from three sources: the National Education Association, hereafter referred to as NEA; the American Association of University Professors, hereafter referred to as AAUP; and the United States Office of Education. Data were obtained from Maryland institutions through a questionnaire and forms designed by the Advisory Council. Data so obtained are hereafter referred to as drawn from a Council questionnaire. The academic year, 1965-1966, for which Maryland, regional and national data on both faculty and administrative salaries where complete and available, was used as the base year for the study.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Maryland's public higher educational institutions, compared with similar institutions throughout the country, are in need of immediate and far-reaching assistance. The study of faculty and administrative salaries indicate that these institutions in the Free State are not able to compete for the quality teachers and administrators that are available.

The first conclusion of the study is that Maryland State College and University Faculty salaries are not up to the national average for comparable institutions.

The data show that Maryland State College and University average faculty salaries for 1966-1967 are:

	Maryland State Colleges	University of Maryland
All Ranks	\$ 9,056	\$10,612
Professors	11,729	14,726
Associates	9,618	11,518
Assistants	8,398	9,561
Instructors	6,821	7,149

In a report published by the AAUP entitled "How Institutions Pay," a list of institutions is given showing in descending order the average salaries paid in 1965-1966.¹ The list is incomplete because it shows only those institutions that authorized publication of their average salaries. In this list of 277 colleges and universities, the University of Maryland was 257th, only twenty from the bottom. None of the Maryland State Colleges had an average salary high enough to be included in the list.

Tables 16 and 17 show how Maryland's State Colleges and University average salaries compare with national average salaries paid by comparable public higher educational institutions throughout the nation. The tables show that at present, Maryland's public Colleges and University are unable to compete for "average" faculty at any academic rank with other public State Colleges and Universities.

TABLE 16

Maryland State College Average Salaries for 1966-1967
Compared with National Average Salaries of State Colleges
for 1966-1967 for All Ranks and Each Academic Rank

Rank	Maryland State Colleges Average Salaries 1966-1967	State Colleges National Average Salaries 1966-1967
All Ranks	\$ 9,056	\$ 9,728
Professors	11,729	12,951
Associates	9,618	10,450
Assistants	8,398	8,815
Instructors	6,821	7,323

Source: Data for Maryland State Colleges obtained from a Council Questionnaire.

Data for State Colleges, National Averages derived from NEA "Salaries in Higher Education, 1965-1966."

¹Source: AAUP, "How Institutions Pay," 1965-1966, Table 10, Washington D. C. (Mimeographed.)

TABLE 17

University of Maryland Average Salaries for 1966-1967
 Compared with National Average Salaries for Large Public
 Universities with Enrollments of 10,000 or more Students
 for 1966-1967 for All Ranks and for Each Academic Rank

Rank	University of Maryland Average Salaries 1966-1967	Large Public Universities National Average Salaries 1966-1967
All Ranks	\$10,612	\$11,436
Professors	14,726	15,482
Associates	11,518	11,620
Assistants	9,561	9,569
Instructors	7,149	7,532

Source: Data for the University of Maryland obtained from a Council Questionnaire. Data for Large Public Universities, National Averages derived from NEA, "Salaries in Higher Education, 1965-1966."

The second conclusion of the study is that average Maryland State College and University administrative salaries are not up to the national medians¹ for comparable institutions.

In a few instances, salaries of some administrators at the University of Maryland exceed the national medians. In general, however, the data given here for selected positions clearly show that Maryland's State College and University administrators are paid average salaries that are below the national medians for comparable public institutions.

¹ Median salaries are used as the basis for comparison because national average salaries for administrators are not available.

Maryland State Colleges
Average Salaries¹
1966-1967

State Colleges
National Median Salaries
1966-1967²

Presidents	\$17, 570	\$19, 927
Undergraduate Deans	15, 000	16, 962
Directors of Admission	9, 640	12, 567
Head Librarians	11, 110	11, 902
Registrars	9, 700	10, 589

University of Maryland
Actual Salaries¹
1966-1967

Large Public Universities
National Median Salaries
1966-1967²

Dean of Bus. Adm.	\$21, 500	\$22, 697
Dean of Education	21, 000	21, 699
Dean, Law School	23, 000	24, 761
Dean, School of Medicine	27, 290	30, 086
Dean, School of Pharmacy	19, 000	21, 566
Director of Libraries	17, 500	18, 837

Merely to make the statement that salaries must be raised, which is often the statement with which faculty and administrative salary studies end, is not an adequate recommendation to direct the deliberations and action of those who must plan for and others who must pass on the final commitments of an institution or State in facing the realities of the higher education personnel problems.

The recommendations, herein made by the Advisory Council, attempt to interpret the study's conclusions in realistic terms so that the State can establish long range policies and guidelines in accord with the nature and extent of its responsibilities for higher education and initiate the course of action that must be taken to develop the level of quality needed in its public colleges and university.

¹ Source: Council Questionnaire

² Source: Data derived from NEA, "Studies in Higher Education, 1965-1966."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations which follow are based upon extensive study, the essential elements of which are presented in this report. The Advisory Council makes the following recommendations:

It is recommended that faculty and administrative salaries in Maryland State Colleges and the University of Maryland be raised to reach the seventy-fifth percentile for comparable institutions of the nation as a whole.

The reasons for the Council's decision to reach the seventy-fifth percentile as the goal for the salaries in Maryland's public institutions of higher education are set forth at the beginning of this chapter in the section entitled, "The Urgency of the Higher Education Salary Question."

The "seventy-fifth percentile" as used in these recommendations means that the average salary recommended is such that one-fourth of the comparable institutions in the nation would have average salaries greater than that being proposed by the Advisory Council.

It is recommended that the year 1970-1971 (Fiscal 1971) be set as the target year for reaching the seventy-fifth percentile level for both faculty and administrative salaries and that the first step in reaching this goal to be put into effect in the 1968 fiscal year.

It is recommended that the seventy-fifth percentile level be reached by Fiscal 1971 by means of equal annual salary increases over four consecutive fiscal periods.

It is recommended that the two-year colleges work toward the adoption of a system of differentiation of rank as a means of recognizing merit and rewarding competence.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council, in making its recommendations, is well aware of the financial problems involved in the support of public higher education. The Advisory Council realizes that it is unrealistic to recommend that the State endeavor to reach immediately the level of quality in its public higher educational institutions implied in a salary scale geared to the seventy-fifth percentile. Some immediate action, nevertheless, is necessary. No less than a firm commitment of the State to the goal of the seventy-fifth percentile level of quality is needed to establish the academic profession's faith in the State's intent. To sustain this faith, a planned program of action to reach the goal within a reasonable time must be implemented.

Because of the diversity of administrative structure in Maryland's public institutions of higher education it is not possible here to detail a program of action showing how administrative salaries may be brought up to the level of the seventy-fifth percentile. The National Education Association, however, publishes annually lists of administrative positions and corresponding salaries for various classifications of institutions which shows the seventy-fifth percentile salaries. These lists can be used as the basis for annual budget requests and review for administrative salaries.

A planned program of action showing the cost of bringing Maryland State Colleges and the University faculty salaries up to the seventy-fifth percentile by fiscal 1971 by means of equal annual increases is shown in Tables 18 and 19. These tables take into account three different kinds of salary costs or increases. Two of these can normally be expected: the annual increase in the number of faculty resulting from larger enrollments and the expansion of programs; and the annual increase in salaries, which has been 6.5% over the past decade, resulting from continued competition within the academic profession. The third increase, a "quality increase," is recommended by the Advisory Council to enable the Maryland State Colleges and the University to attract and retain a high quality of faculty. Tables 18 and 19 show the "quality-increase" as well as the other increases.

In making its recommendations, the Advisory Council does not in any way endorse an "across the board" increase for every member of the faculty or administration. The Advisory Council strongly reiterates its previously stated principles that "salaries should be based on merit, and that rigid State-wide or institution-wide salaries based solely on academic rank and length of tenure are unrealistic." It is expected, therefore, that some faculty members and administrators will be rewarded with increases higher than others while some may receive no increases.

TABLE 18

Cost of Bringing Maryland State College Average Salaries Up to the
 Seventy-Fifth Percentile by Means of Equal Annual Increases,
 Including Allowance for an Annual 6.5% Increase,
 To Reach Goal by 1970-1971

YEAR	Number* of Faculty	Progression of Average Salary All Ranks From Present Salary To Seventy-fifth Percentile	Amount to Maintain Present Position of Average Salaries All Ranks Estimated 6.5% Annual Increase for Nation as a Whole Per Faculty Member	Additional Amount to Raise Salary Levels to 75th Percentile by 1971 Per Faculty Member	Combined Increases	Total Cost** of Increase to Maintain Present Position	Total Additional Cost** to Reach 75th Percentile	Grand** Total Cost of Increases
							Total Cost** to Reach 75th Percentile	Grand** Total Cost of Increases
1966-1967	703	\$ 9,056 (Present)	-	-	-	-	-	-
1967-1968	800	10,308	\$589	\$663	\$1,252	\$471,200	\$530,400	\$1,001,600
1968-1969	895	11,560	627	625	1,252	561,165	559,375	1,120,540
1969-1970	1,000	12,812	668	584	1,252	668,000	584,000	1,252,000
1970-1971	1,088	14,064 (75th Percentile)	711	541	1,252	773,568	588,608	1,362,176

* Faculty projections based upon data supplied by Maryland State Colleges
 ** Totals include the estimated increase in the number of faculty members as shown in first column.

TABLE 19

Cost of Bringing the University of Maryland Average Salaries Up to the
 Seventy-Fifth Percentile by Means of Equal Annual Increases,
 Including Allowance for an Annual 6.5% Increase,
 To Reach Goal by 1970-1971

YEAR	Number* of Faculty	Progression of Average Salary All Ranks From Present Salary To Seventy-fifth Percentile	Amount to Maintain Present Position of Average Salaries All Ranks Estimated 6.5% Annual Increase for Nation as a Whole Per Faculty Member	Additional Amount to Raise Salary Levels to 75th Percentile by 1971 Per Faculty Member	Combined Increases	Total Cost** of Increase to Maintain Present Position	Total Additional Cost** to Reach 75th Percentile	Grand** Total Cost of Increases
1966-1967	1,644	\$10,612 (Present)	-	\$964	\$1,654	\$1,257,180	\$1,756,408	\$3,013,588
1967-1968	1,822	12,266	\$690	857	1,654	1,546,180	1,662,580	3,208,760
1968-1969	1,940	13,920	797	749	1,654	1,914,980	1,584,884	3,499,864
1969-1970	2,116	15,574	905	642	1,654	2,282,060	1,447,710	3,729,770
1970-1971	2,255	17,228 (75th Percentile)	1,012					

* Faculty projections based upon data supplied by the University of Maryland
 ** Totals include the estimated increase in the number of faculty members as shown in first column.

RATIONALE FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

The rationale for immediate action on the collegiate personnel problem in Maryland stems from the economic factors of supply and demand for academic personnel, the changed characteristics of the academic profession -- its articulateness and mobility, and the urgent need of the State to provide for its own economic future. Finally, it is recognized that not all states are equally able, financially, to attract and retain in its colleges and universities the kind of personnel essential for the development of a quality-oriented system of public higher education.

There is reason to believe that Maryland is financially able to support the highest quality educational system and must, for its own sake, commit itself to this goal.

Effective tapping of the State's wealth for public purposes, the means of accomplishing which are beyond the purview of the Advisory Council for Higher Education, coupled with an increase in the share of public spending put into higher education, as proposed in these recommendations, will significantly improve the quality of public higher education in Maryland.

CHAPTER X

POPULATION ANALYSIS

NATURE AND PURPOSE

Effective planning for higher education, must reflect Maryland's unique characteristics. It is with this consideration in mind that the Advisory Council has undertaken a population review to acquire, analyze, and compile population data relevant to Maryland's higher educational needs. The study identified research agencies and institutions whose functions it is to collect and organize data pertaining to Maryland's population. It also established with them lines of communication to facilitate the efficient flow of information necessary for Council functions in this area.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The data collected and analyzed relate to many population variables. The data are being organized to present a perspective of these variables as they operate within the State as a whole and within and between regions, political sub-divisions and population centers. Typical data in this study deal with birth and death rates, migration, school enrollment and educational attainment, population estimates and projections with particular emphasis on those aspects relating to higher education.

DIVERSITY IN MARYLAND

Maryland's July 1, 1966 population, which was estimated to be 3,632,140 has grown, and is expected to grow through 1985, at a rate that exceeds that of the United States as a whole. All of the State's regions show an annual increase in population as a result of differences in birth and death rates, and a recent Maryland State Department of Health Report indicates that all, with the exception of the Baltimore Metropolitan Area, showed net gains in migration in 1964.¹ Yet, Maryland's population, when assessed in terms of many demographic variables is characterized by diversity and lack of uniformity.

A major portion of the State's lack of uniformity in many population variables can be attributed to the uneven distribution of its population. As of July 1, 1966, 81.6% of Maryland's residents were living in a central corridor of counties which comprised less than 1/3 of the State's land area, and 18.4% were distributed across the remaining 2/3 of the State.

¹ Maryland State Department of Health, Final Vital Statistics Tables-Maryland, 1964, Sept. 1965, p. vii.

It is projected that Montgomery and Prince George's counties will show the largest regional increase in population for the 1965-1970 period, in which time their percentage of the State's population will grow from 26.8% to 30.0%. In these two counties, the increase alone (239,910 persons) represents more people than there will be in the total population of any one of a number of other counties (19 counties) in 1970.

FUTURE PLANS

The complete population analysis, which is currently being prepared for release this year will contain data in table, graphic, and narrative form. These data, once analyzed and organized, will be periodically up-dated as new materials become available.

CHAPTER XI

UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATION

A study of possible year-round operation for Maryland's system of public higher education was prompted by Senate Resolution 31 of the 1965 Legislative Session requesting the Advisory Council for Higher Education to "explore the possibilities of having year-round operation of publicly supported and publicly operated institutions of higher education."

The Advisory Council undertook a study of possible year-round operation with the assistance of a consultant, Dr. W. Hugh Stickler, co-author of the Southern Regional Education Board's publication The Year Round Calendar in Operation. The study was developed on the basis of facility utilization data, with the thought that a serious over-utilization of present and proposed facilities would leave few alternatives to a change of academic calendar from the present two semesters and a summer session to some other form consisting of more terms of shorter duration, for example, a four quarter system or three semester (trimester) system.

Questionnaires were sent to all of the public institutions in Maryland requesting data on utilization both during times of the day and during the week, and data on calendar, enrollments, enrollment projections and the summer session. The data were analyzed to ascertain the degree of present and projected space utilization.

YEAR-ROUND OPERATION VS. CALENDAR

It is important to point out that year-round operation is not necessarily a function of the academic calendar. The two semester and summer program can effectively use 40 weeks of the year, while a quarter system would generally use 44 weeks, and a trimester system 45 weeks. Both the trimester and quarter systems usually break down in arranging "special" sessions for elementary and secondary teachers and others that attend only for regular summer sessions. The result is that the full period is not usually utilized effectively in either the quarter or trimester calendars.

FACILITY UTILIZATION AND ENROLLMENT PRESSURES

The utilization of space was assessed in terms of criteria set forth by William S. Fuller and Leroy W. Hull¹, consultants, in a report to the Maryland State Planning Department in 1964. These criteria were in the form of standards for space utilization. The standards call for a classroom to be scheduled two-thirds of the hours that it is available, to be sixty percent full when scheduled, and for each student to be assigned 15 square feet of floor space, adjusted for size of institutions and for laboratory purposes. Table 20 shows the recommended standards when applied to a basic 55 hour week.

TABLE 20

**RECOMMENDED SPACE FACTORS FOR A BASIC
55 HOUR WEEK, BY SIZE OF INSTITUTION, FOR
CLASSROOMS AND LABORATORIES**

	5, 000 Students And Over	1, 000-5, 000 Students	1, 000 Students And Under
Classroom	01.7 sq. ft/ contact hr	.8 sq. ft/ contact hr	1.0 sq. ft/ contact hr
Laboratory	2.8 sq. ft/ contact hr	2.4 sq. ft/ contact hr	2.4 sq. ft/ contact hr

The institutions were asked to supply the Advisory Council with information relating to the following items on classrooms and laboratories:

1. Present square footage of classrooms and laboratory space.
2. Square footage to be added by 1970 in both categories.
3. Square footage to be removed from service by 1970 in both categories.
4. The total number of student contact hours per week in both categories. This figure of contact hours is one which takes into account all students - full-time, part-time, graduate, undergraduate, etc.

¹Fuller, William S., and Leroy E. Hull, Space Utilization Study and Future Capital Outlay Needs for Public Institutions of Higher Education in Maryland, a report to the Maryland State Planning Department, Bloomington, Indiana, 1964.

Information was also requested on the institutional enrollment projections for 1970.

A projection of facility utilization was made for each institution to the year 1970. That projection assumes that the student contact hours will remain in the same proportion to the enrollment as now exists. These data are summarized in Tables 21 and 22.

On the basis of these projections, it appears that a few of the two-year colleges will be at a high level of facility utilization by 1970, but for the most part, these institutions should be able to accommodate the additional students. One caution must be observed; that is that the projections to 1970 are based on expected additional facilities to be ready to accommodate students at the projected time. If a facility should not be ready at the expected time, the institution could probably not absorb the additional students into the limited facilities already existing.

In terms of the present academic calendar, and from the institutional projections, it appears as though the institutions will be able to accommodate the expected students through 1970. Considerations at present for an academic calendar change, therefore, must be based on factors other than current enrollment pressures and projected enrollments for the next few years.

CONSIDERATIONS

If a change of academic calendar is not justified on the basis of enrollment pressures, are there other factors which might justify a change of calendar at this time? The Advisory Council took the following factors² into account in reaching a decision.

FRAMEWORK FOR EFFICIENCY

The academic calendar should represent a framework for presenting effectively and efficiently throughout the year the educational programs with which the institution is charged. An academic calendar is not an end, it is a means to maintaining and enhancing the quality and quantity of performance on the part of the institution, the faculty, the staff, and the students.

² Schoenfeld, Clarence A., and Neil Schmitz, Year-Round Education, Madison, Wisconsin, Dunbar Educational Research Services, Inc. 1964.

TABLE 21
SQUARE FEET OF CLASSROOM AND LABORATORY SPACE
IN PUBLICLY SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS, WITH
NET EXPECTANCY BY 1970

	Present Sq. Ft.		Sq. Ft. Removed By 1970		Sq. Ft. Added By 1970		Net Sq. Ft. By 1970	
	Class-Room	Lab	Class-Room	Lab	Class-Room	Lab	Class-Room	Lab
Allegany C. C.	4511	2372	4511	2372	14500	11800	14500	11800
Anne Arundel C. C.	*	* -	* -	* -	* -	* -	* -	* -
Balto. J. C.	27480	30340	-	-	-	-	27480	30340
Catonsville C. C.	7672	3325	6000	-	30000	18000	31672	21325
Charles Co. C. C.	*	* -	* -	* -	* -	* -	* -	* -
Essex C. C.	3150	1647	3150	1647	9814	12757	9814	12757
Frederick C. C.	9030	1017	-	-	-	-	9030	1017
Hagerstown J. C.	2548	-	2548	-	23141	15797	23141	15797
Harford J. C.	8856	7335	-	-	4854	30496	13710	37831
Montgomery J. C.	15734	21062	-	-	-	-	15734	21062
MJC Rockville Campus	28118	16901	-	-	85382	29199	113500	46100
Prince George's C. C.	17797	4094	17797	4094	25175	9015	25175	9015
Bowie St.	7508	3820	-	-	8300	11200	15808	15020
Coppin St.	8348	1944	1008	936	6970	5483	14310	6491
Frostburg St.	16373	10563	7070	5838	28913	27645	38216	32370
Salisbury St.	11813	2541	3367	2541	13523	16331	21969	16331
Towson St.	42897	23175	-	-	*	*	*	*
Morgan St.	51555	38165	6000	-	15000	5000	60555	43165
Maryland St.	15492	23461	-	-	-	-	15492	23461
St. Mary's	10700	2540	-	-	29315	4450	40015	6990
Univ. of Md.	265938	262056	20000	2788	64759	64112	310697	323380

* Data Not Available.

TABLE 22

SPACE FACTORS FOR PUBLICLY SUPPORTED
INSTITUTIONS - FALL 1965, AND PROJECTED TO 1970

	Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment		Total Contact Hours Per Week				Total Space Factors (sq. ft./contact hr.)			
	1965	1970	1965		1970		1965		1970	
			Class	Lab	Class	Lab	Class	Lab	Class	Lab
Allegany C. C.	415	620	5868	888	8761	1326	.8	2.7	1.7	8.9
Anne Arundel C. C.	447	1025	**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Balto. J. C.	2048	3000	29404	9811	43047	14363	.9	3.1	.6*	2.1*
Catonsville C. C.	1010	2200	11508	1392	25064	3032	.7	2.4	1.3	7.0
Charles Co.	99	150	**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Essex C. C.	404	1400	5508	1035	19085	3586	.6	1.6	.5*	3.6
Frederick C. C.	180	348	3134	318	6058	615	2.9	3.2	1.5*	1.9*
Hagerstown J. C.	514	1073	8337	1768	17399	3690	-	-	1.3	4.3
Harford J. C.	545	1393	9217	1648	23549	4211	1.0	4.4	.6*	9.0
Montgomery J. C.	2251	3115	31808	8167	43990	11295	1.4	4.6	2.9	5.9
Prince George's C. C.	862	3733	14965	1174	64789	5083	1.2	3.5	.4*	1.8*
Bowie St.	524	868	7466	1137	12364	1883	1.0	3.4	1.3	8.0
Coppin St.	496	509	9282	672	9523	689	.9	2.9	1.5	9.3
Frostburg St.	1598	2475	24156	4403	37440	6816	0.7	2.4	1.0	4.7
Salisbury St.	644	1297	10473	970	21082	1953	1.1	2.6	1.0*	8.4
Towson St.	2949	7956	47092	6673	127007	18011	.9	3.5	**	**
Morgan St.	3118	3624	44855	6587	52122	7654	1.2	5.8	1.2	5.6*
Maryland St.	708	923	11992	1997	15626	2602	1.3	11.7	1.0*	9.0*
St. Mary's	322	680	5816	805	12278	1699	1.8	3.2	3.3	4.1
Univ. of Md.	21652	25810	288015	78804	387067	105913	.9	3.3	.8*	3.1*

*More Utilization of Space Projected for 1970

**Data Not Available

CALENDAR RELATED TO NEED

There is no one academic calendar that is best for all institutions. A sound calendar is indigenous, growing out of the particular traditions and needs of a particular institution and its constituency. While there is no one "perfect" academic calendar there are several calendars, including a number of year-round academic calendars, which can be made to work effectively if institutions want them to work. The Advisory Council in its 1966 recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly of the State of Maryland stated that every institution should study its academic calendar with a view to possible year-round operation. The Advisory Council stands ready to assist the governing boards of institutions by reviewing and recommending on any forthcoming proposal.

PROFITABLE UTILIZATION

The calendar should provide a pattern by which students may profitably utilize the facilities and resources of the institution throughout the year as their own capabilities, finances, and objectives dictate. Flexible opportunities for teaching, study, and travel by the faculty should likewise be facilitated. There are many different kinds of academic calendars with varying degrees of utilization and flexibility. The two semester plus summer session calendar can provide for a high degree of utilization when the summer session is made an integral part of the school year. This means enhancement of the present summer program by the offering of additional courses and programs.

CHARACTER OF CALENDAR

The calendar should be characterized by instructional periods of adequate length, by efficient breaks between instructional periods, by economical use of administrative time, and by opportunities for educational service to groups other than full-time students. This last point is an important consideration, for there are many groups which require special summer or short courses. Teachers for instance, desire to attend summer sessions. The needs of these groups must be met effectively.

UNNECESSARY CHANGE

Unnecessary changes should be avoided. No calendar change should be made merely for the sake of "making a change." By the same token, however, academic calendar practices of long standing are not "scared cows"; they should be constantly reexamined with a view to meeting better the educational and social problems which confront the American People. The Advisory Council takes the position that a major change in academic calendar would be justified if realistic enrollment projections exceed realistic space utilization factors for present and planned

academic facilities. The study should be periodically up-dated in order continually to evaluate the present calendar.

COSTS

Above all, the pursuit of academic calendar change as a sheer economy device would be a major mistake: Decisions concerning an institution's academic calendar should not be made primarily on the basis of what seem to be savings in expenditures. Either increased utilization or an extended academic year will require that the total amount of money spent will be increased. If the present summer session is enhanced, the amount of State funds involved will be of necessity be greater numer of students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the data, and the above listed considerations, the Council makes the following recommendations:

It is recommended that no major change in calendar seems necessary at the present time. Individual institutions may, however, find it advantageous to modify their calendar to better serve the needs of their students.

It is recommended that each institution work toward enhancing its summer session to adequately serve its own students, as well as special groups. The goal should be to achieve year-round operation within the framework of the present calendar.

It is recommended that State support be given to the summer session in each institution to the degree that full-time undergraduates pay the same amount of money per credit hour as they pay during a regular semester.

It is recommended that the space utilization study by the Advisory Council be periodic, probably every two years, in order to allow the Council to have sufficient data to make intelligent recommendations on needed facilities. If utilization data indicate the need, the Advisory Council will give further consideration to a change of academic calendar.

CHAPTER XII

PILOT STUDY OF RECIPROCITY

Maryland is not educationally self-sufficient. Despite recent rapid expansion of its educational facilities, interstate student migration appears likely to continue. In many ways states prefer to function together as cooperating elements rather than apart as independent entities, yet, there is a tendency in public education in the United States to erect higher barriers which restrict students wishing to study at institutions outside of their own state.¹ The widening gap between resident and non-resident tuition fees in public institutions and more stringent admission requirements or quotas are in effect closing doors to out-of-state students. Of course, all states have the right to limit admission of out-of-state students and indeed the responsibility to assure that their own residents receive the best possible services from their own state institutions. However, "balanced" interstate migration could better guarantee increased educational opportunities for all students.

Thus it is that the Advisory Council is conducting a pilot study to investigate the issues underlying the need for, and the possibility of the establishment of mutually beneficial reciprocal arrangements between Maryland and its neighboring states.

STEPS TAKEN

While continuing its pilot study of reciprocity, the Advisory Council has collected data and information relevant to the issues involved by means of:

1. A study of the aims, provisions, uniqueness, and effects of interstate reciprocal agreements as provided for in (a) a series of bilateral arrangements promoted by the Mid-America State Universities Association, (b) the contract programs of the Southern Regional Education Board, the New

Source: ¹"College Student Mobility Attracts Public Policy Attention," Higher Education, April, 1964, 20: 7, pp. 3-6.

England Board of Higher Education, and the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, and (c) broad based actions taken by the legislatures of individual states.

2. An analysis of information relating to students selection out-of-state institutions as a first choice in the Council's "Post-High School Plans of Seniors Survey" for 1965 and 1966.
3. A preliminary analysis of replies received from 2,551 questionnaires addressed to a sampling of 1966 Maryland seniors who said that they were planning to attend out-of-state institutions in the Fall of that same year.
4. A preliminary analysis of replies from Advisory Council questionnaires which were sent to:
 - a. All Maryland public higher education institutions, requesting information regarding out-of-state enrollments and admissions policies and/or quotas.
 - b. Higher education institutions in neighboring states, requesting information on the number of Maryland students enrolled and the programs they were pursuing.
5. Analysis of the U. S. Office of Education's unpublished survey "Residence and Migration of College Students - Fall, 1963."

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF PILOT STUDY

Maryland students continue to seek admission to out-of-state higher education institutions at a high rate. Both the 1963 U. S. Department of Education Study and the Council's 1965 and 1966 "Post-High School Plans of Seniors Survey" indicate that more than one-fourth of Maryland's college population attend higher education institutions outside of Maryland (TABLES 23, 24).

A high percent of Maryland students continuing their post-high school education out of state are enrolled in institutions located in neighboring states. The 1966 "Post-High School Plans of Seniors Survey" indicated that of the Maryland Seniors Planning to Attend Out-Of-State Institutions 36.2% (2,860) were planning to do so in neighboring states an Washington, D. C. (See Table 25). The 1963 U. S. Office of Education "Resident Migration Study" showed that 53.8% (9,191) of Maryland's

Undergraduate Students Enrolled in Out-Of-State Institutions were attending institutions in neighboring states and Washington, D. C. Tables 26, 27, 28 give additional detail on these students.

On the basis of more than 1300 replies to the Advisory Council's Survey of 1966 seniors selecting higher education institutions out of state, Table 29 was developed showing their reasons for going, by the percent of students indicating the reason as one of primary or secondary importance.

Analysis of data reflecting reasons for attending institutions out of state indicated that 12.8% of those students going out of state gave as a primary reason "Program of Choice is Unavailable in Maryland." However, many of the programs for which they were going out of state were in fact offered at institutions in this State. "Unavailable" may in some cases have been interpreted to mean such things as: available at institutions with no dormitory space, available at an inaccessible community college, or uninformed about its existence.

Policies affecting the admission of out-of-state students to Maryland's public institutions of higher education need further study as they weigh heavily upon reciprocal agreements. Presently, standards of admissions and/or quotas as set by governing boards of individual schools and out-of-state resident tuition policies vary among Maryland institutions.

Presently several states participate in contract and exchange programs which differ in structure, student qualification requirements, and complexity and degree of effectiveness. However, review of these programs indicates a high degree of agreement on common objectives aimed at eliminating out-of-state tuition fees and gaining some preference in admissions for those students whose special needs require that they go out of state.

When considering a Reciprocity Program, many alternatives have to be taken into account including:

- a. one multilateral as opposed to many bilateral agreements
- b. the establishment of fiscal equilibrium by means of quotas rather than through the gross exchange of funds
- c. a system coordinated on a state-wide basis as opposed to many negotiations between individual institutions in respective states
- d. a separate exchange program as opposed to broadening of existing scholarship programs to include students going out of state.

CONCLUSIONS

The data and materials studied to date indicate that reciprocity is needed for Maryland. One area in which a great deal of need has been identified is in student migration between Maryland and its neighboring states.

A regional effort to establish reciprocal agreements between Maryland and its neighboring states should aim at lowering the financial barriers that discriminate against less affluent students and obtaining a "second preference" in admissions for selected students going out of state.

As a result, an agreement could provide students a wider variety of programs from which to choose, improve the educational environment of institutions, and eliminate the partial unbalance of opportunity that results from some students having to choose between attending out-of-state institutions within thirty minutes or less of their homes versus board and room payments for similar programs at Maryland institutions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Governor of Maryland take the initiative in contacting the Governors of neighboring states and the officials of the District of Columbia for the purpose of studying the feasibility of higher education reciprocity arrangements among a group of neighboring states.

One means of providing interstate leadership for such a study would be to take advantage of the fact that Maryland and several of its neighboring states belong to Compact (The Education Commission of the States). Compact representatives from participating states may be asked to act as a Reciprocity Steering Committee to study the issues involved and make recommendations to appropriate state officials or agencies. Professional staff for such a Steering Committee might be provided by the higher education coordinating agencies in the respective states.

TABLE 23

DISTRIBUTION OF MARYLAND STUDENTS
ATTENDING OUT-OF-STATE INSTITUTIONS
IN THE UNITED STATES: BY REGION, TYPE
OF CONTROL, LEVEL, AND TOTAL

	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS*	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	TOTAL GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
ALL REGIONS	22,882	6,081	16,801	14,278	3,764	10,514	5,798	972	4,826
New Eng.	1,682	61	1,621	1,373	50	1,323	294	10	284
Mid-East	12,353	1,740	10,613	5,585	431	5,154	4,231	141	4,090
Gt. Lakes	2,281	804	1,477	1,824	545	1,279	416	247	169
Plains	567	212	355	422	115	307	117	77	40
So. East	4,524	2,191	2,333	3,988	1,834	2,154	446	289	157
So. West	346	236	110	238	157	81	68	49	19
Rk. Mtn.	227	136	91	198	114	84	22	17	5
Far West	490	290	200	258	127	131	184	122	62
U. S. Service Schools	411	411	--	391	391	--	20	20	--
Other Parts	1	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--

SOURCE: "Residence and Migration of College Students - Fall, 1963", Unpublished Study of U. S. Office of Education:
Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

*Includes full-time and part-time students.

TABLE 24
STUDENT OUT-MIGRATION

1963 RESIDENT SURVEY	1965 SENIOR SURVEY	1966 SENIOR SURVEY
31% (22,882) of Maryland's Residents Enrolled in Higher Education Institutions are Attending Institutions Out of State	27.6% (8,044) of Those High School Seniors Planning to Continue With Post-High School Education Plan to do so Out of State	28% (7,899) of Maryland High School Seniors Planning to Continue Education This Year Plan to do so Out of State

Sources: 1965 and 1966 "Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools".

"Residents and Migration of College Students Fall 1963", Unpublished Study, U. S. Office of Education: Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

TABLE 25
OUT-MIGRATION OF 1966
MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

Counties	Number of 1966 Maryland Seniors Planning to Continue All Types of Post-High School Education	Seniors Selecting Institutions in Other States		Seniors Selecting Institutions in Neighboring States	
		Number of Seniors	% of Total Planning to Continue	Number of Students	% of Total Planning to Continue in Other States
STATE TOTAL	25,069	7,899	31.5	2,861	36.2
ALLEGANY	652	173	26.5	88*	50.9
ANNE ARUNDEL	1,407	441	31.3	179	40.6
BALTIMORE	4,848	1,231	25.4	575	46.7
CALVERT	125	53	42.4	13	24.5
CAROLINE	121	59	48.8	26	44.0
CARROLL	367	112	30.5	31	27.7
CECIL	276	145	52.5	79	54.5
CHARLES	289	139	48.1	26	18.7
DORCHESTER	187	76	40.6	25	32.9
FREDERICK	361	69	19.1	51	73.9
GARRETT	101	47	46.5	25	53.2
HARFORD	647	169	26.1	45	26.6
HOWARD	340	97	28.5	32	33.0
KENT	83	30	36.1	10	33.3
MONTGOMERY	5,030	2,273	45.2	684	30.1
PRINCE GEORGES	3,546	1,283	36.2	363	28.3
QUEEN ANNE	78	35	44.9	20	57.1
SAINT MARY	262	101	38.5	31	30.7
SOMERSET	136	35	25.7	19	54.3
TALBOT	135	49	36.3	29	59.2
WASHINGTON	601	216	35.9	104	48.1
WICOMICO	342	139	40.6	47	33.8
WORCESTER	168	64	38.1	35	54.7
BALTIMORE CITY	5,102	863	16.9	324	37.5

SOURCE: "Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools", 1966

TABLE 26
 PERCENT OF MARYLAND RESIDENTS
 IN NEIGHBORING STATES: BY STATE,
 FOR TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND TOTAL
 FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE
 ENROLLMENT IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

STATE	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	N. J.	VA.	W. VA.	PA.	D. C.	DEL.
TOTAL	13,336	2.3	11.0	5.3	18.8	59.6	3.0
Public	2,968	2.1	26.4	15.5	9.2	39.1	7.6
Private	10,368	2.3	6.6	2.4	21.6	65.5	1.6
TOTAL FULL TIME UNDERGRADUATE	6,658	3.4	20.3	9.6	30.4	31.6	4.6
Public	1,514	2.9	46.4	25.8	15.0	.3	9.6
Private	5,144	3.5	12.6	4.8	35.0	40.1	3.2

Source: "Residents and Migration of College Students" - Fall 1963, Unpublished Study, U. S. Office of Education: Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

TABLE 27
 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL
 SENIORS PLANNING TO CONTINUE
 THEIR POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
 IN NEIGHBORING STATES FOR PUBLIC AND
 PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS: BY STATE AND
 PERCENT OF TOTAL

	TOTAL NUMBER	PERCENT OF TOTAL PLANNING TO ATTEND BY STATE					
		N. J.	VA.	W. VA.	PA.	D. C.	DEL.
TOTAL	2,860	4.7%	23.6%	12.1%	28.6%	23.2%	7.8%
Public	711	4.5	41.8	30.5	11.3	0.2	11.7
Private	2,089	4.8	16.9	5.3	35.0	31.7	6.3

Source: "Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools", 1966

TABLE 28

NUMBER OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS SURVEYED SELECTING
 SCHOOLS IN NEIGHBORING STATES, BY KIND OF
 INSTITUTION* AND STATE

STATE	W. VA.	VA.	PA.	DEL.	D. C.	N. J.
GRANT TOTAL	346	675	818	222	664	135
<u>Public</u>						
Total	235	322	87	90	2	35
University	37	163	44	82	0	33
Liberal Arts	68	88	0	8	0	0
Teacher Ed.	85	63	42	0	2	1
Technical	0	10	0	0	0	0
Two Year	45	0	1	0	0	1
Other	0	29	0	0	0	0
<u>Private</u>						
Total	111	353	731	132	662	100
University	0	0	143	0	320	29
Liberal Arts	108	228	466	0	55	34
Technical	0	0	57	0	0	9
Religious	0	1	6	0	62	0
Two Year	3	82	35	132	111	27
Other	0	11	24	0	114	1

*As classified by the U. S. Office of Education "Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1965"

Source: "Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools," 1966

TABLE 29

PERCENT OF 1966 MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS GIVING REASONS
FOR ATTENDING SCHOOLS OUTSIDE OF MARYLAND*

Reason	Percent Giving Reason as one of Primary Importance	Percent Giving Reason as one of Secondary Importance
Program is Superior to any in Maryland	19.0%	15.4%
Want to be Far From Home	15.9	23.6
Program of Choice is Unavailable in Maryland	12.8	4.3
Could not Attend the Size School of Choice in Maryland	7.3	5.4
Within Weekend Commuting Distance of Home	6.6	14.3
Within Daily Commuting Distance of Home	4.5	3.1
General Preference for Specific School out of State	4.4	3.1
Want to Attend Religious School	4.0	1.9
Out of State More Desirable Location	2.3	4.0
Received Scholarship or Loan Out of State	2.0	.7
Could not Gain Admission of Choice in Maryland Schools	1.8	1.6
Going to Live With Relatives	1.4	2.5
Wanted to Attend Prestige School	1.1	1.0
Want to Attend One-Sex School	1.1	.7
Program is Less Expensive Out of State	1.0	1.3
Friends are Going to the Same School	.8	7.4
Dorm Space Not Available in Maryland	.7	.8
Recommendation of Guidance Counselor or Teacher	.7	.6
Parents Moving to New Location	.7	.5
Other	5.4	5.6

*The questionnaire provided an opportunity for multiple responses within both the primary and secondary categories.

Source: "Survey of Post-High School Plans of Seniors in Maryland Schools", 1966

CHAPTER XIII

PROGRAMS

Through its Policy Committee on the Role and Scope of Institutions, the Advisory Council has undertaken a number of comprehensive studies in accordance with Article 77, Section 327 of the Annotated Code of Maryland which states that "The functions of the Council shall include.... Investigation of the needs throughout the State for undergraduate, graduate and adult education, for professional and technical training...., and presentation of plans and recommendations for the establishment and location of new.... programs." The purpose of the studies is to provide knowledge and detailed facts about higher education programs and their relationship to the needs of Maryland's society, and to enable the State-wide planning of programs that may be continuously revised as society's needs change. Recommendations emerging from these studies will consider the broad public interest and the responsibilities of the Governor and General Assembly, as well as the commitments of the colleges and universities.

INITIATION OF NEW PROGRAMS

The Advisory Council's initial step in carrying out its statutory responsibility for planning new programs was to adopt a series of guidelines defining the roles of the various elements within Maryland's structure of higher education, as set forth by the Committee on Role and Scope. Subsequently, the Committee advised that the Council's next steps should be to conduct a State-wide inventory of programs, and to develop criteria and procedures for initiating new programs.

STATE-WIDE INVENTORY OF PROGRAMS

During deliberations of the Committee on Role and Scope, it was determined that recommendations concerning scope (that is, specific curriculum offerings) could be made by the Council only after it has gotten an accurate picture of what programs are presently offered and planned, and at what levels.

A technical committee, consisting of representatives of public and non-public degree-granting institutions, has been formed to conduct an inventory of the post-secondary programs in Maryland. The technical committee has initiated its work with the assistance of Dr. Allan Tucker, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the University System of Florida, who has experience in this area of inquiry. The first stage of the inventory will be a detailed survey of all existing and planned curricula leading toward a degree or certificate.

Future stages of the inventory will attempt to refine and expand these initial data by obtaining such additional information as may be required. These advanced data will be of value not only to the Council, but also to State officials and individual institutions as they consider how best to plan the allocation of their resources and facilities. Furthermore, a complete inventory of higher education programs will assist high school counselors by apprising them as to what technical and academic opportunities are available to students in Maryland.

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR NEW PROGRAMS

Another important problem of the Council in furnishing objective advice as to the establishment of new programs may be summarized by the following general question: When, where, and under what circumstances should a new post-secondary degree-program be established?

In order to solve this problem, the Council is currently working to develop a set of criteria upon which to analyze proposals for new programs. With the assistance and approval of the Committee on Role and Scope, a "pilot instrument" has been devised by which institutions can inform the Council in writing of any proposed new programs. The institutions have been requested to present a memorandum of the proposal at an early stage of development, and again after the new program has been approved by their governing board.

Since the introduction of this instrument (shown below), several institutions have already submitted their proposals to the Council for its information and advice. Future consideration of proposals and further accumulation and analysis of information involving new programs, should lead ultimately to the establishment of criteria and procedures by which to study more objectively the desirability and feasibility of proposed new programs. These criteria, in turn, also are expected to point the way toward eliminating unnecessary duplication and improving the quality of higher educational programs in general.

Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education Pilot
Instrument for Developing a Proposal for a New Program

1. Justification of the Proposed Program

(Indicate justifications for the proposed program as carefully and succinctly as possible. State justifications under the following headings: (1) Cultural or Economic Need, i. e., any objective measure of the need and the validity of the measure, the acceptability of graduates to a professional or occupational group; (2) Similar Existing Programs, i. e., similar programs in the State, student populations served and graduate output, distinctiveness of the new program; (3) Status of the Institution in the Major Related Areas; (4) Identification of Institutional Resources; (5) Status of the Field or Profession to Which the Program Relates.)

2. Objectives of the Proposed Program

(The goals of the new program should be made explicit. In addition, the particular competencies which are to be developed through the program of instruction should be related to these objectives. If professional in nature, indicate whether the proposed program would meet accreditation standards.)

3. Description of the Proposed Program

(Identify the name, level, and course of study of the program.)

4. Requirements for the Implementation of the Proposed Program

(Specify the support needed for the program on a year by year basis until the anticipated optimal size is reached. Include support items under the following headings: Staff, Students, Facilities, Library, Equipment, Supplies. You are requested not to rely merely on general statements.)

5. Procedures for the Initiation of the Proposed Program

(Provide a resume' of what prior study has been given to this program. Please include the ways in which the institution proceeded in its investigation of need for and in its examination of its capabilities to support the new program. Also, indicate the current status of the proposed new program at the institution, and the time schedule anticipated for the introduction of the new program.)

6. Impact of the New Program on the Institution Making the Proposal

(Some indication should be given of how and to what extent the new program will relate to the basic purpose of the institution, change the institution's size, and affect its existing programs. If the new program will modify existing programs in the institution, please explain these modifications.)

STUDIES TO DETERMINE THE NEED FOR PROGRAMS

In addition to its efforts toward the development of a program inventory and criteria and procedures by which to examine new programs, the Advisory Council has recently initiated several studies to determine the need for new programs, and the expansion of existing programs, in specific fields.

MEDICAL, NURSING AND PARAMEDICAL NEEDS

In the course of its 1965 proceedings, the Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education gave some consideration to the availability of medical training facilities in the State. A Council subcommittee reviewed the 1962 report of the Committee on Medical Care of the Maryland State Planning Commission and inquired into the progress toward meeting the recommendations of that report. The Council noted that the study under review covered the period to 1975, that an additional medical school might be required in subsequent years, and that the lead time for the development of such a school approximates ten years. For these reasons, the Council determined to launch a study of the need for additional facilities to meet the demands of the 1980's. At the request of the Governor's office, it was agreed that the study should be broadened to include the consideration of Maryland's needs for expanded nursing and paramedical training programs as well.

A Council subcommittee of distinguished persons drawn from the academic, medical and health communities has been formed to direct the conduct of the study. In consideration of what the general parameters and priorities of the study should be, the subcommittee is currently deliberating the expert advice given recently by Dr. Joseph F. Volker, Vice-Chairman of the National Advisory Council for the Education of Health Professions. It is highly probable that the subcommittee will propose a request for additional funds in order to initiate the first stages of the study.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL MANPOWER NEEDS

In response to its statutory mandate to investigate the needs throughout the State for professional and technical training, and a mandate given by the recent Governor's Conference on Higher Education to establish a mechanism for communication between business and education, the Advisory Council has organized a special steering committee to study Maryland's business and industrial manpower needs. The steering committee, whose members are considered key leaders of State industry, was organized by the Advisory Council for Higher Education in cooperation with the Department of Employment Security, the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore, and the Division of Vocational Education of the State Department of Education who were

convinced that a study of State manpower needs is essential to the fullest development of Maryland's economy, and should be initiated as soon as possible.

The stated purpose of the steering committee was to explore the possibilities of a long-range survey of the manpower needs of Maryland's industries. During its preliminary session, the steering committee expressed doubts about the feasibility of a conventional study of manpower needs which, it was pointed out, would probably be subject to short-range obsolescence before it could be implemented in higher education. It seems, therefore, that new approaches to the problem will be required. In the meantime, the committee, as it deals with problems of manpower and other matters of mutual concern, may serve as a valuable mechanism for the ongoing communication between the business and education communities.

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A 1961 State Department of Education requirement states that, within 10 years of that date, all teachers must have attained the master's degree or its equivalent in order to receive an advanced professional certificate. As a result of this requirement and an increasing demand for an additional year of graduate work, most State institutions with teacher education curricula are rapidly expanding their programs to offer master's level work for teachers. The Council has been requested by institutional administrators to study the following major issues involved with this problem: (1) the extent to which public institutions should expand their master's level teacher education programs; and, (2) the extent to which requirements for admission to such programs should be modified, if at all. The Committee on Role and Scope has taken into account the magnitude of these issues, and has set the stage for further deliberation of the problem.

CHAPTER XIV

STUDY OF LIBRARY FACILITIES, SERVICES, AND COOPERATION

The need for improved library facilities and services has for some time been recognized by the authorities in Maryland's public institutions of higher learning. To define this need more clearly, several of these institutions undertook studies related to their own library resources in order to determine present capabilities and future growth.

PREVIOUS STUDIES OF PUBLIC COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

In May, 1960, Felix E. Hirsch (Chairman), Trenton State College, Sarah D. Jones, Goucher College, and Elizabeth Simkins submitted a report on the library of the State Teachers College at Frostburg.

On February 8, 1963, a survey report of the Albert S. Cook Library at the Towson State College was completed by Felix E. Hirsch (Chairman), Trenton State College, Bernadine C. Hanby, Northern Illinois University, and Frank N. Jones, Peabody Institute.

In April, 1965, a team of consultants, consisting of Felix E. Hirsch (Chairman), Trenton State College, Sarah D. Jones, Goucher College, and William L. Williamson, Montclair State College, submitted a report to the Board of Trustees of State Colleges on the libraries of Coppin, Bowie, and Salisbury State Colleges.

In April, 1965, an ad hoc Committee for a Study of Library Needs presented a report on the University of Maryland libraries. This committee had been appointed (by President Elkins) to make the study in conformity with a resolution of the University's Faculty Senate.

BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The Board of Trustees of State Colleges requested the Advisory Council for Higher Education to initiate a more thorough study of libraries for public higher education in Maryland. The Advisory Council gave immediate consideration to this request and in formulating its own plans broadened the scope of the study to include all the higher educational institutions of the State and that could be made by the contributions the Enoch Pratt Free Library, the Library of Congress, and the library facilities of the State Department of Education.

In submitting its budget request for fiscal 1967, the Advisory Council included funds for the proposed library study. The Maryland legislature, at the request of the Governor, allocated funds to the Advisory Council for Higher Education to make a study, state-wide in scope, of public higher educational library services, development, and possibilities for cooperation and coordination.

On May 20, 1966, the Advisory Council, under the chairmanship of Mr. Ellery B. Woodworth, called a meeting of all interested parties to discuss the library problems of State institutions and the possibilities for a cooperative study of library resources. Because of the comprehensiveness of its intended study, the Council sought the viewpoint and assistance of the personnel of all major library facilities in the area. Invitations were sent to and accepted by the University of Maryland, the State Colleges through the Board of Trustees, the Community Colleges, the State Department of Education, the Library of Congress, the Enoch Pratt Free Library. The meeting was held on Thursday, May 26, in the State Office Building at 301 West Preston Street.

DEVELOPMENT AND SCOPE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Those present at the meeting were asked to act as an ad hoc committee to help develop and review the findings of the proposed study. The list of members of this committee is to be found in the front of this book.

The committee members suggested that the Advisory Council engage the services of a professional library consultant firm to conduct an objective study of higher educational library services and the possibilities for inter-library cooperation and coordination.

The Council's staff wrote the specifications for the study and requested proposals from four consultant firms: Documentation Incorporated, Systems Development Corporation, Nelson Associates Incorporated, and Planning Research Corporation. After a thorough review of the proposals submitted, the Council awarded the study contract to Nelson Associates.

In general, the scope of the study includes an analysis of library resources and needs, cooperative acquisition policies, technical processing, inter-library communication, computer applications, co-operation with private institutions, and cooperation with agencies other than colleges and universities.

The study, which began in November, 1966, is to be completed before March, 1967, after which a full published report will be available from the Advisory Council.

CHAPTER XV

SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING LABORATORY STUDY

House Resolution No. 76 requested the Advisory Council for Higher Education, the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland, the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges, and the State Superintendent of Education to study the feasibility and desirability of establishing a School Facilities Planning Laboratory at the University of Maryland.

The Advisory Council, in response to this request, called together representatives of the institutions named in the Resolution to discuss the issue presented. Mr. Henry Knott, Chairman of the Advisory Council's Committee on Institutional Facilities, presided at the meeting held on May 16, 1966, attended by Dr. Frank Bentz of the University of Maryland, Mr. Jackson Saunders, of the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges, Messrs, George A. Myers and Raymond I. Miller of the State Department of Education and members of the Advisory Council staff.

As a follow-up to the meeting, each of the agencies presented to the Advisory Council a statement on the School Facilities Planning Laboratory. Excerpts from these statements are included here.

From the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges:

"There appears to be no doubt that the establishment of such a laboratory would be of tremendous value to the Board of Trustees as it makes further progress in school facility planning. I do feel, however, that the laboratory could make its greatest contribution in the context of total State building requirements, not just educational facilities."

Dated: October 3, 1966
Comer S. Coppie, Director.

"The Board's representative took the position that the purpose of the laboratory should not be to develop standardized school construction systems.

College personnel who are planning buildings, as well as architects working with them, are constantly facing design problems requiring new approaches. It does not appear that a systems approach suggesting a standardized design applicable to many educational situations would be feasible.

The Board.....feels that a school planning laboratory could be of definite value in the following areas:

1. To serve as a resource to the faculty and planning staff at each College. ...A function involving publication and dissemination of research data is implied here.
2. To serve as a resource to architects designing higher educational facilities. ... Collection and evaluation of literature on new developments in educational media and its relationship to design requirements is related to functions suggested above.
3. To serve as a construction materials testing center and as a resource of objective information relative to the adequacy of building materials, exterior and interior finishing, and furnishings.

If the planning laboratory could accomplish the research, evaluation, educational, and promotional functions in a positive way, the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges would firmly support it."

Dated: October 3, 1966
Jackson S. Saunders, Staff Specialist.

From the State Department of Education:

"As directed, I surveyed our local school systems to determine the need for a separate planning laboratory in Maryland and to determine what services such a laboratory might provide.

The instructions for the questionnaire implied that a non-response would indicate the lack of concern, interest or need for a planning laboratory in Maryland. Ten local superintendents responded, with five stating that a school planning facility would not be of real benefit to their school system. Three of the five respondents who indicated a need for a school planning laboratory, believe that it should be part of the State Department of Education.

Based on these responses and the fact that the University of Maryland, jointly with the State Department of Education, is establishing an Administration Center on the College Park

campus, I do not believe a formal meeting of the study group is appropriate at this time."

Dated: July 26, 1966
George A. Myers, State Supervisor of School Plant Planning.

From the University of Maryland:

"This matter has been discussed in detail with representatives of the College of Education of the University and we are of the opinion that there is no real need for a facilities research laboratory at this time. Our people feel, however, that there is need for an administrative research center to provide answers to over-all problems related to educational administration. Accordingly, our College of Education is developing an application to the Federal Government which would provide for the establishment of a regional administrative research center at the University. The proposal is being discussed with the State Department of Education and with school superintendents in the State and we are confident of their support.

It is possible that if such a center is developed, a portion of the research may be devoted to facilities problems.

To briefly summarize our position, we feel that there is more need for administrative research than for facilities research."

Dated: October 6, 1966
Frank L. Bentz, Jr., Asst. to the President

CONCLUSION

The Advisory Council believes that the designated institutions have adequately responded to the request made in House Resolution No. 76. Further investigation of the School Facilities Planning Laboratory, its feasibility and desirability, may be undertaken after plans outlined in the above statements are worked out in greater detail.

CHAPTER XVI

DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MARYLAND - 1966

During the past year, Maryland has made a number of significant strides forward in higher education. Some of this progress has been in the form of additional educational offerings; some has been in the form of improved administrative practices; some has been in the form of increased use of technology; and some has been in the improvement of communication about higher education.

The Council feels that the progress in Maryland is being made in a desirable manner as well as with effective results. The initiative for these changes has come from the individual institutions, governing boards, and State agencies concerned. The Advisory Council has worked with these institutions, boards, and agencies in a facilitating and coordinating role. The Council provides this unifying service to those concerned with the development of higher education in the State, thereby enabling other groups to develop their own plans on the basis of advice supported by up to date statistical evidence and the thinking of knowledgeable lay and professional persons serving on Council committees.

EXPANSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The Baltimore County Campus of the University of Maryland was dedicated on October 30, 1966. Its opening enrollment was 758 students, in addition to which there were approximately 300 evening students. The University projects an enrollment of approximately 20,000 students for this campus by 1985. This new campus provides expanded opportunities for additional numbers of Maryland residents to attend a State comprehensive university. The University has been highly successful in its initial recruiting and in obtaining an excellent staff for this campus so that there is every indication that the University of Maryland-Baltimore County will be able to develop a graduate program at this location at a faster rate than had been originally anticipated, in addition to expanding its undergraduate program. The University officials are working closely with the community, and the business and science-oriented industries that it will serve, in order to make its offerings as responsive as possible to the State's needs.

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE COLLEGES

The Board of Trustees of the State Colleges and its staff are continuing to refine the administrative procedures and to develop policies which will improve the quality of the institutions under its control and assist its administrators and faculty in fulfilling their role in the State system of public higher education. A recent example of the quality of the staff work of this Board and the attention that can be given to one segment of public higher education when it has a board concerned exclusively with its development can be found in the agenda and exhibits of the December 2, 1966, meeting of the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges.

Plans were laid during 1966 for the cooperative study by the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges and the Advisory Council with regard to the expansion of the State college system.

All the State Colleges seem to be making good progress in sustaining the reorganization objective for a multi-purpose liberal arts and teacher education curriculum within the State college system. Since 1963, two of the State colleges, Salisbury State College and Frostburg State College, have received an accreditation evaluation by the regional accrediting association, Middle States Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. The accreditation of Salisbury State College was reaffirmed consistent with the multi-purpose objectives in 1965. Frostburg State College was visited in December, 1966. The Middle States Association will take official action concerning accreditation for Frostburg early in 1967. These developments are evidence of the progress that has been made by these institutions in the past few years.

Again the Advisory Council reaffirms its commitment to the tripartite system of public higher education as approved in principle by the 1963 General Assembly. One four-year State College - Morgan State College - is not under the jurisdiction of the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges. Maryland law provides that Morgan State College come within the jurisdiction of this Board when three of the former State teachers colleges have been regionally validated consistent with the new objectives of the State Colleges.

It is recommended that jurisdiction over Morgan State College be transferred to the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges as rapidly as is consistent with sound action and in accordance with the statutory provisions.

The Advisory Council is exploring, with the Attorney General's Office, steps which should be taken and will make more specific recommendations when all the necessary facts and legal opinions are at hand.

The laws of Maryland also provide that the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges shall exercise the direction and the control of "any other State college offering a four-year course of study that may hereafter be established." St. Mary's College is in the process of becoming a four-year institution. The Advisory Council is exploring, with the Attorney General's Office, the relationship of this institution to the State system of public higher education, and expects to make more definitive recommendations when the four-year status of St. Mary's College is achieved.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Several counties have made progress toward the establishment of community colleges in their areas. One college, Chesapeake College, on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, has been added to this segment of higher education during 1966. Of the eleven community colleges currently in operation, two received their regional accreditation by the Middle States Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges in 1966; namely, Essex Community College and Catonsville Community College, both in Baltimore County. These accreditations bring to a total of five the regionally accredited community colleges in the State. Six other currently operating community colleges in Maryland are yet to be regionally accredited.

Another development concerning the community colleges was the recommendation made in 1966 by the Advisory Council that the governance at the local level and the coordination at the State level be re-organized giving these colleges boards which would be separate from those governing the public school system. Legislation was introduced during 1966 and passed the House of Delegates by a vote of 85 to 17 but did not come before the Senate prior to adjournment. The Council's recommendations on this matter are contained elsewhere in this report.

COOPERATION OF PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Advisory Council recognizes the important role of the private colleges and universities and their distinctive contributions to the system of higher education in Maryland. Cooperation through mutual sharing of data and ideas has characterized the relationship between the private higher educational institutions and the Advisory Council. These institutions, during the past year, have cooperated with the Advisory Council in the development of coordinated data collection through the United States Office of Education. The private colleges and universities are presently represented on every committee established by the Advisory Council for Higher Education.

DEVELOPMENT OF A MARYLAND EDUCATIONAL DATA NETWORK

An unusual example of foresight and cooperative planning is the creation of an educational data system computer complex under the leadership of the Office of the Data Systems Coordinator of the State Budget Bureau. This Maryland Educational Data Network will have its center at Towson State College and will service the seven State colleges by means of leased lines. In addition, the network will be connected to the data processing centers at the University of Maryland, Annapolis State Office Building, and the Baltimore State Office Building. The network is designed to provide important data not only to the colleges, but to their governing boards to the State Department of Education, to the Advisory Council for Higher Education, and to other State agencies. It will be used not only for administrative purposes, but for academic purposes and for educational research. This application of new technology has tremendous potential for improved handling of data, improved administrative and instructional practices and better information for decision-making purposes.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARYLAND EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NETWORK

The 1966 session of the General Assembly enacted legislation to provide Maryland with a system of state-wide, open circuit, noncommercial television. The central production center for programs of the Maryland ETV network will be located in the Baltimore metropolitan area.

In recent meetings with representatives of the University, the State Colleges and the Community Colleges, ETV officials indicated that among other uses of the ETV network every effort will be made to make study time and professional assistance available to all of Maryland's educational institutions, either for the production of programs for open circuit broadcast or for taping and subsequent on-campus playback. Reception of the programs of the network will be available in the classrooms and dormitory facilities of Maryland's institutions of higher education.

The Advisory Council for Higher Education recognizes the potential value of this medium in the development of higher education in the State and looks forward to a cooperative working relationship with the new agency.

COOPERATION AMONG STATE AGENCIES

The increasingly effective communication among State agencies concerned with various aspects of higher education in Maryland is notable. The initiative for a number of studies made by the Advisory

Council for Higher Education has had its source in the request by other agencies for more detailed study than they could themselves provide. For instance, the Budget Bureau requested the Advisory Council to make an in-depth study of administrative and faculty salaries in all public institutions of higher learning.

The State Planning Department has referred to the Advisory Council, matters concerned with the nature of facilities involved in the expansion of the University of Maryland and the possibility of additional State college facilities in the Maryland counties surrounding Washington, D. C. Similar cooperation has been given by the Regional Planning Council, the Department of Employment Security, the State Department of Health, the State Scholarship Board, the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation, the State Department of Education, and others. This inter-agency cooperation, in addition to the excellent assistance furnished the Council by the administrative staffs of the University of Maryland, the State colleges, the community colleges, and the private colleges, has contributed to the "fostering of a climate of cooperation and unified endeavor in the field of public higher education" that was the intent of the Legislature in establishing the Advisory Council.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

A development which represents a "first" in Maryland is the holding of the Statewide conference on higher education, on November 5, 1966. This Governor's Conference on Higher Education was sponsored by the Advisory Council upon recommendation of its Community Viewpoint Committee. The theme of the Conference was Higher Education and the Economic Future of Maryland." Approximately 300 persons from business, industry, labor, education, government, civic groups, and other community groups attended this invitational Conference. Not only did the conferees have an opportunity to hear from business and educational leaders in prepared presentations, but those in attendance participated in workshop-sessions which provided the Council with valuable suggestions for future planning. A brochure entitled "Higher Education and the Economy of Maryland" was developed in conjunction with this Conference, and is available upon request from the Advisory Council.

The continued two-way communication between the community and the higher educational profession is assured by the dedicated interest and activity of the Council's Community Viewpoint Committee which is broadly representative of the citizens of the State and which is constantly examining ways in which the community and educators may best be mutually informed as to their respective interests, needs, and services.

COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The United States Office of Education has recently been re-organized to include a National Center for Educational Statistics. The purpose of this Center is to obtain nation-wide data about higher education. Entirely new data-gathering instruments have been devised by the Office of Education and sent to all public and private colleges and universities throughout the country. The Advisory Council for Higher Education has made an agreement with the United States Office of Education, in co-operation with all of the college presidents or their governing boards with in Maryland, to receive copies of all data being sent to the United States Office of Education as part of their Higher Education General Information Survey. This arrangement should make it possible to reduce the number of questionnaires sent to colleges and universities within the State and at the same time obtain more useful data than have previously been available.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER STATES

The State of Maryland is an active participant in the work of the Southern Regional Education Board, comprised of 16 states. This Board holds annual legislative work conferences which contribute ideas and data on current issues in higher education that affect states within this region. The Board also provides a mechanism that makes it possible for selected students to attend institutions in other states when certain programs are not available to them in their own state. The Southern Regional Education Board, through its staff services and research reports, provides valuable assistance on a continuing basis to the Council and to the State as a whole.

A new development in inter-state cooperation on a nation-wide scale is the establishment of the Education Commission of the States. The Maryland General Assembly, in 1966, took formal action to establish this State's representation on this nation-wide Commission. One of the chief purposes of the Education Commission of the States is "to provide a forum for the discussion, development, crystalization, and recommendation of public policy alternatives in the field of education." In order to make available important information to the States, the Commission is initiating a number of studies that should be useful to the individual states in planning their educational programs at elementary and secondary levels and at the higher education level.

The Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education has also developed informal arrangements for the exchange of studies and other data with other states through their coordinating Councils for Higher Education.

תְּהִלָּה
בְּרִיאָה
בְּרִיאָה
בְּרִיאָה

UNIV OF MD COLLEGE PARK



3 1430 03636887 8

DO NOT CIRCULATE

